DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 406 716 EA 025 035

TITLE	Survey of Major Issues and Trends Relevant to the Management of Elementary and Secondary Education. Trends & Issues, Number 8.
INSTITUTION	ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, Eugene, Oreg.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
REPORT NO	ISBN-0-86552-121-2
PUB DATE	Sep 93
NOTE	49p.
CONTRACT	RR93002006
AVAILABLE FROM	Editor, ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, 5207 University of Oregon, Eugene, OR 97403-5207 ($3.50).
PUB TYPE	ERIC Publications (071)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrator Education; *Educational Administration; *Educational Change; Educational Facilities; Educational Finance; *Educational Trends; Elementary Secondary Education; Governance; Labor Relations; Principals; School Choice; School Law; *School Restructuring; *Sociocultural Patterns; Teaching (Occupation)

ABSTRACT

Research conducted during the last decade supports the notion that educational reform must be comprehensive and systemic. This paper summarizes major issues and trends in the management of elementary-secondary education. The synthesis is designed to promote an understanding of how broad in scope systemic reform must be. Twelve chapters present information on trends in the following areas: the changing social and economic context; educational reform and restructuring; the evolving patterns of governance; leadership--the changing principal's role; the training and selection of school administrators; women and minorities in educational administration; instructional personnel; the school-choice movement; school finance; labor relations; educational facilities; and school law. References accompany each section. (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 406 716

TRENDS & ISSUES

A series of papers highlighting recent developments in research and practice in educational management

Survey of Major Issues and Trends Relevant to the Management of Elementary and Secondary Education

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management
College of Education, University of Oregon
1787 Agate Street, Eugene, Oregon 97403

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EA 025 035

TRENDS & ISSUES

A series of papers highlighting recent developments
in research and practice in educational management

Survey of Major Issues and Trends Relevant to the Management of Elementary and Secondary Education

ERIC®

September 1993

ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE ON EDUCATIONAL MANAGEMENT
University of Oregon, 1787 Agate Street, Eugene, Oregon 97403. (503) 346-5043

International Standard Book Number 0-86552-121-2
ERIC/CEM Trends and Issues Series, Number 8
Clearinghouse Accession Number: EA 025 035

Printed in the United States of America, September 1993

ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management
University of Oregon
1787 Agate Street
Eugene OR 97403
(503) 346-5043
Fax (503) 346-2334

Design: University Publications, University of Oregon.

The University of Oregon is an equal opportunity, affirmative action institution committed to cultural diversity.

The Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) is a national information system operated by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education. ERIC serves educators by disseminating research results and other resource information that can be used in developing more effective educational programs.

The ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, one of several such units in the system, was established at the University of Oregon in 1966. The Clearinghouse's subject area is educational management, policy, governance, law, and facilities at the elementary and secondary levels.

Prior to publication, this manuscript was submitted for critical review and determination of professional competence. The publication has met such standards.

This publication was prepared with funding from the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education under contract no. OERI-RR93002006. The opinions expressed in this report do not necessarily reflect the positions or policies of the Department of Education. No federal funds were used in the printing of this publication.

Clearinghouse National Advisory Board

Timothy J. Dyer, Executive Director, National Association of Secondary School Principals
Patrick Forsyth, Executive Director, University Council for Educational Administration
Joyce G. McCray, Executive Director, Council for American Private Education
Martha McCarthy, Vice-President, Division A, American Educational Research Association
Richard D. Miller, Executive Director, American Association of School Administrators
Maggie Rogers, Director, Information Center, Northwest Regional Education Laboratory
Samuel Sava, Executive Director, National Association of Elementary School Principals
Thomas Shannon, Executive Director, National School Boards Association
Don I. Tharpe, Executive Director, Association of School Business Officials International
Gene Wilhoit, Executive Director, National Association of State Boards of Education

ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF
Philip K. Piele, Professor and Director
Linda Ettinger, Associate Professor and Associate Director
Stuart C. Smith, Associate Director for Publications

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Foreword

The Trends and Issues Series is dedicated to the summary and analysis of research and knowledge as expressed in recent literature, as well as accounts of current exemplary practice in school districts and classrooms across the nation. The content of this analysis is topics that pertain to educational management at the elementary and secondary education levels.

Until this issue, all papers in the Trends and Issues Series have been confined to specific topics, such as change processes, parent involvement in their children's education, school restructuring, and the like. This issue represents our first attempt to gather in a single cover a broad survey of, if not all, at least the bulk of topics that compose educational management.

To say the least, this undertaking required a sizable investment of time and creative energy by a number of people. The following staff members contributed to this survey: Mary Lou Finne, Margaret Hadderman, Lynn Isaacson, Linda Lumsden, and Stuart Smith. Ron Renchler, a freelance research analyst, also wrote a section.

We hope this paper stimulates more critical thinking and informed practice in the field of educational policy and management.

Philip K. Piele
Professor and Director

Contents

Introduction	1
Changing Social and Economic Context	2
Educational Reform and Restructuring	6
Evolving Patterns of Governance	11
Leadership: The Changing Principal's Role	15
Training and Selection of School Administrators	18
Women and Minorities in Educational Administration	22
Instructional Personnel	27
The School Choice Movement	29
School Finance	33
Labor Relations	36
Educational Facilities	39
School Law	42

Introduction

It is widely recognized that, in the information age, an educated citizenry is one of the most valuable assets a nation can possess. As people have come to appreciate the full economic import of education, they have become more supportive of educational improvement.

School reform cannot be undertaken haphazardly. Research that has been carried out during the past decade lends support to the idea that reform must be comprehensive or "systemic"—embracing all elements of the educational enterprise—if it is to succeed.

Much like ingredients simmering together in a stew, these elements affect one another; the "flavor" of each element changes, and is changed by, other elements. In addition to interaction among elements internal to the educational system, webs of connection exist between education and a variety of social, economic, and political factors rooted outside the bounds of education. These elements in the larger social environment also strongly influence the nature of educational change.

Through exposure to the reform literature, many members of the school community are aware that it is ineffective to attempt to institute school change in a piecemeal fashion. For example, if only one correlate of school effectiveness (such as high expectations for all students) is made a priority, its power to improve student performance is diluted unless other correlates of school improvement are instituted simultaneously. Systemic changes must occur before substantial gains will be seen at the classroom level. It is not enough to alter the teaching methods, curriculum objectives, and so forth; the complex system that we call a school must be altered at a fundamental level.

With greater appreciation of how various social conditions such as poverty, hunger, homelessness, child abuse, and so forth can impair a child's ability to focus on school-related tasks, school personnel have begun forming partnerships with social-service agencies. More energy is also being devoted to involving students' families in the educational process. And alliances are being forged with the business community.

By sketching trends and issues across a host of subjects such as these, we hope educators and others who read this report will add to their understanding of just how broad in scope systemic reform must be if indeed all children are going to have a chance to succeed in America's twenty-first century. Not only the schools, but society itself must change.

Changing Social and Economic Context

As the beginning of the twenty-first century approaches, we are in the midst of a number of social, economic, and demographic changes. Although the effects of these trends will continue to ripple through all social institutions for years to come, schools are especially sensitive to such shifts. As Jeanne E. Griffith and others (1989) point out, "More than most other public services, education is inextricably linked to demographic trends." Schools, which serve a younger population, are at a disadvantage compared to most other social institutions, because they have less lead time to prepare for changes in the complexion of society.

Young people in today's world are faced with a barrage of challenges and stresses that may prevent them from attaining their full academic potential. Each day a large number of children arrive at school mentally or emotionally unprepared to learn what is being taught. A wide range of factors can place young people among the ranks of those who have an elevated risk for persistent patterns of underachievement or social maladjustment. There are children who were affected while still in the womb by alcohol or other drugs used by their pregnant mothers, and there are those who have been abused or neglected in other ways. Gnawing hunger and medical problems that are not being attended to make it nearly impossible for others to focus on what's occurring in the classroom. There are also immigrants at risk of educational difficulties because they lack proficiency in English.

Still other children, particularly members of ethnic and racial minority groups, may feel caught between two distinctly different cultures—a school culture in which middle-class values and expectations are dominant, and a home environment in which other values may be emphasized. There are families who have no homes at all and families who, because of limited income, are forced to live in unsafe neighborhoods where the security most people associate with home is absent and where parents may be afraid to let their children go outside to play. Teen parents also have a high risk of school failure or dropping out, as do youth with drug problems. These are just a few of the social and economic problems that can be barriers to the educational success of children and young people.

Increasing Ethnic Diversity

Although different economic and social factors are operable in different parts of the country and specific national trends have more relevance for some districts than for others, it is useful for educators to be aware of both national and local demographic changes. At the national level, ethnic diversity is increasing. In some parts of the U.S., nonwhites are rapidly approaching or have already reached majority status. Between 1980 and 1990, the white population in the U.S. increased by 8 percent, while the African-American population increased by 16 percent, the Hispanic population by 44 percent, and Asians and others by 65 percent (Hodgkinson 1991). During the next several years, some demographers expect the pool of nonwhite children and youth to increase and the white youth population to decline (Hodgkinson 1992).

As the cultural makeup of society becomes more diverse, educators are recognizing that it is important for them to become familiar with a variety of cultures; they are also gradually learning how to create multicultural environments in which students from a wide array of backgrounds feel accepted and supported. Sensitivity among educators to racial and cultural biases that may be present in textbooks or other instructional materials is also increasing. More schools are also recruiting minority teachers and administrators who can serve as role models for students from

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

diverse backgrounds and help to foster higher academic and professional aspirations among minority students.

Changing Family Patterns

In addition to changes in ethnic composition that occurred in the U.S. population between 1980 and 1990, all forms of "atypical" families also became more prevalent during the same ten-year span, while what used to be considered a "typical" family (consisting of a married couple and children) declined. In 1990, for the first time in this nation's history, married couples with children at home were no longer "the single largest block of American households." Outnumbering these families were married couples who were either childless or whose children no longer lived at home and "nonfamily" households. Only 26 percent of children lived in two-parent families with a bread-winner and a homemaker (Center for the Study of Social Policy 1992).

Today, nearly half of all American children will spend some of their childhood or adolescence being raised by single parents. The increase in single-parent families translates into more children growing up in poverty (the topic of the next section) and more children being left alone. The Center for the Study of Social Policy reports that 64 percent of all children did not have any parent at home full time. The number of households that are headed by single women is on the rise, while two-parent families are declining. Approximately fifteen million children are being raised by single mothers.

Childbearing by teenage mothers has become a pressing problem that directly affects the quality and completion rate of education for these mothers. Throughout the 1970s and early 1980s, the birth rate to teenage mothers in the United States fell sharply. But in the late 1980s there was a sharp upswing in teenage parenting. According to *New Realities of the American Family* (Dennis A. Ahlburg and Carol J. De Vita 1992), published by the Population Reference Bureau, more than half a million births occurred to teenage mothers in 1989—13 percent of all births that year. The current birth rate to teens in the United States is five times higher than in many European countries.

Currently, over eleven million workers are paid salaries that do not exceed the minimum wage by more than fifty cents an hour. When this group is subdivided, the largest category consists of single women over twenty-five with children to support. Whereas single mothers with children earn about $11,000 a year, in 1988 the average family income among couples with children was about $34,000, over three times as much (Hodgkinson 1992).

Pointing to the erosion of the family and the loss of parents as first teachers, Samuel G. Sava (1992), executive director of the National Association of Elementary School Principals, says: "It is not better teachers, texts, or curricula that our children need most; it is better childhoods."

Poverty

One common thread that runs through many at-risk families is poverty. The ranks of the poor in our nation have risen markedly in recent years. Alarmingly, one-fourth of preschool children in America live in poverty (Hodgkinson 1991). In 1990, over 20 percent of all children under age eighteen were living in poverty, 19 percent were without health insurance, and 13 percent were hungry on a regular basis (Hodgkinson 1992). The poverty rate among white children under age eighteen in 1990 was about 15 percent; for African-Americans, the rate was 45 percent; and for Hispanics, 38 percent (Alsalam and others 1992).

Young families (those in which the head of the household is under thirty) have been undergoing significant economic deterioration. Among this group, the poverty rate was 20 percent in 1973; by 1990, it had doubled to 40 percent (Cliff Johnson 1992). As a whole, young families with children suffered substantial income losses in real dollars during the 1980s, and since the onset of the recession in 1990 they have experienced further erosion of their economic status.

For each year that children live in poverty, the likelihood that they will perform below grade level increases by 2 percent (Reeves 1988). And if a child attends a school that enrolls a large percentage of low-income students, the likelihood of failure in school rises dramatically. From the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

beginning, many poor children have several strikes against them. For example, poor mothers often receive little or no prenatal care and are more likely to have low birthweight babies. In poor families, the diet and medical care of children are often inadequate, which impairs their ability to be attentive and responsive in school. Children in low-income families are also more likely to be ill in their early years and are more prone to sensory-motor deficits. In addition, children growing up in poverty often have fewer opportunities for socialization.

Poverty, not minority status, seems to be the most reliable predictor of below-average educational performance. A child who is a member of a minority group and whose parents are college graduates living in the suburbs tends to perform roughly the same academically as a white student who is a child of parents with comparable socioeconomic status and educational levels (Hodgkinson 1992). Therefore, if the proportion of minority students living in poverty could be reduced, we would expect to see a corresponding increase in educational performance among minority students.

Abandonment of Innercities

Migration to the suburbs is another demographic trend that is having a significant impact on schools and student enrollment. As jobs and people continue to flee to the suburbs, the problems that plague many innercity schools gain an even stronger foothold. Unfortunately, although the percentage of "at risk" students attending innercity schools is extremely high, the student-teacher ratios at such schools are also typically high while the opportunity for individual attention and instruction is very low.

One demographer predicts that innercity schools may become a "socioeconomic dumping ground" during the next twenty years (Hodgkinson 1992). Also, fewer jobs are available in the middle economic range, which is widening the gap between the "haves" and the "have nots."

Demographic Planning

Before engaging in long-range planning, more school administrators are seeing the necessity of monitoring national demographic trends and collecting and analyzing local demographic data to obtain a glimpse of how their districts are likely to be affected by population-related changes and other social and economic trends. Districts that take the time to collect and analyze demographic data will be better equipped to restructure their educational programs to meet the needs of a changing student population.

Thomas Glass (1987) contends that many school leaders are not aware of the wealth of demographic information at their disposal. Glass identifies several potential sources of "soft" demographic data. First, federal census data can provide educational planners with a good overview of a population and help administrators to draw conclusions about the population's likelihood of producing children who will attend local schools. Zoning information on land use and development proposals also has relevance for administrators and can be obtained from county planning departments; general population projections undertaken by county planners are also useful.

In addition, knowing the number of building permits issued by the city or county during a given year can give administrators a very rough idea about whether economic activity in a community is increasing or decreasing. Data on the number of live births among district residents, which can usually be obtained from county health departments, are also valuable.

Studies conducted by large businesses, economic development agencies, and organizations such as the Chamber of Commerce also often contain information of value to school districts. Such studies are often undertaken to acquire data about the labor force, the type of housing, and so forth.

Finally, educational planners may also be able to glean useful information from utility companies, which conduct comprehensive surveys to estimate the number of hookups that will be needed in each section of a city or county during a specified ten-year span; in some cases, however, utilities keep these survey results confidential.

Glass suggests that one way to use these kinds of data is to weight them according to their ability to accurately project into the future,

perhaps applying a rating scale from 1 to 5 to indicate each source's predictive value. He cautions that any effort to predict enrollment that is based on such data should be considered a "best guess."

Ahlburg, Dennis A., and Carol J. DeVita. *New Realities of the American Family*. Washington, D.C.: Population Reference Bureau, Inc., 1992. ED 350 113.

Alsalam, Nabell, and others. *The Condition of Education: 1992*. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics, 1992. 421 pages. ED 344 347.

Center for the Study of Social Policy. *Kids Count Data Book*. Third Edition. Washington, D.C.: author, 1992.

Glass, Thomas E. "Demographic Sources and Data Available for School District Planners and Architects." *CEFP Journal* (May-June 1987): 7-13. EJ 358 019.

Griffith, Jeanne E.; Mary J. Frase; and John H. Ralph. "American Education: The Challenge of Change." *Population Bulletin* 44, 4 (December 1989): 1-36. ED 320 206.

Hodgkinson, Harold L. *A Demographic Look at Tomorrow*. Washington, DC: Institute for Educational Leadership, 1992. 18 pages.

_____. *Beyond the Schools: How Schools and Communities Must Collaborate to Solve the Problems Facing America's Youth*. Arlington, Virginia; and Alexandria, Virginia: American Association of School Administrators; and National School Boards Association, 1991. ED 346 552.

Johnson, Cliff. *Vanishing Dreams: The Economic Plight of America's Young Families*. Washington, DC: Children's Defense Fund, 1992.

Reeves, M. Sandra. "Self-Interest and the Common Weal: Focusing on the Bottom Half." *Education Week* III, 31 (April 27, 1988).

Sava, Samuel G. *A National Perspective*. Alexandria, Virginia: National Association of Elementary School Principals, January 1992. 4 pages.

Educational Reform and Restructuring

As the character and composition of American society undergo change, schools are profoundly affected. Many cries for educational reform and restructuring being heard today spring from an awareness that the world has changed so radically that traditionally organized schools are less successful than they used to be in unleashing the energies and talents of both students and educators (Rebarber 1992). The perceived mission of schools has shifted from merely "offering education" to "ensuring that all students learn" and receive a high quality education (Darling-Hammond 1992). States, federal agencies, and business leaders, in addition to educational leaders and practitioners, are all proposing new approaches to organizational change and school improvement.

Systemic Reform

Many lessons learned as a result of the flurry of reform efforts enacted during the 1980s are guiding current approaches to reform. In retrospect, one weakness of many reform programs initiated during the past decade was a lack of coordination, both among individual projects and among the multiple levels of government that fund and regulate education. Consequently, many early reform programs were fragmented and lacked cohesion (Olson 1992). Often little thought was given to how one initiative might affect or relate to another. In addition, competing initiatives were seldom prioritized, and underlying rules and traditions integral to the existing system were rarely questioned. When individual projects are implemented in a disjointed, uncoordinated manner, their effectiveness is diluted. Projects operate in isolation or may even conflict with one another.

Instead of adopting a number of disparate projects to placate varied interests, many reformers today are beginning to recognize the importance of developing an overarching ("systemic") reform strategy. Shashkin and Egermeier (1992) argue that "comprehensive restructuring holds the most promise for successful systemic change."

This latest wave of educational reform incorporates elements of earlier strategies that, when tried on a piecemeal basis, have failed. It draws inclusively on rational-scientific information, political action, and change in organizational culture, while also making use of an array of change strategies (fixing the parts by adopting proven innovations; fixing the people through training and development; fixing the schools by developing their capacities to solve their own problems; and fixing the system by restructuring education at the state, district, and building levels).

Fundamental Change

Restructuring differs from past reform approaches in that it seeks to institute changes that address the underlying causes, instead of the superficial symptoms, of problems related to the educational system. According to one source, the term *restructuring* implies "fundamental changes in organization, power relationships, and guiding principles" (Rebarber); another states that it consists of substantial change in "how schools are designed, how school systems operate, how teaching and learning are pursued, and what goals for schooling are sought" (Darling-Hammond 1992). Another author states that restructuring changes "fundamental assumptions, practices, and relationships, both within the organization and between the organization and the outside world, in ways that lead to improved and varied student learning outcomes for essentially all students" (Conley 1993).

At the school level, restructuring may involve "developing different views of learning and social experiences of students, transforming

the professional work life of teachers, changing the nature of leadership and governance in schools, and reshaping the relationships between schools and their external communities and social service agencies" (Peterson and Bixby 1992).

In restructuring schools, governance is usually perceived differently. Teachers have greater involvement in leadership and decision-making and fill more varied roles; administrators facilitate vision and direction, orchestrate change, allocate resources, and create opportunities for leaders to emerge from among the teachers and the community at large.

Vision for Change

The importance of commitment to a vision is often emphasized by those who advocate restructuring. School leaders cannot merely create their own school vision and then attempt to force feed it to staff. A commitment to the vision by the school staff and other members of the school community develops through a participatory, collaborative process. In addition to developing a vision that can guide and unite projects, schools moving toward restructuring must also identify outcomes to be assessed; obtain broad support of the community; redefine the roles of teachers, administrators, students, and parents; and change basic organizational practices to more effectively meet the needs of at-risk students (Conley 1992, Newmann and Clune 1992).

Performance-Based Standards

To meet the challenge of preparing all students for a meaningful role in the work force or for postsecondary training, a number of states are establishing performance-based standards for high school graduation against which to gauge students' educational progress. "These expected outcomes encourage all students to learn at higher levels and provide benchmarks by which to assess student performance and the effectiveness of reform efforts," notes the Education Commission for the States (1992a). Standards also can help to concretize a broad, abstract vision of education by translating it into statements of desired performance outcomes. Through this process a framework is created that helps a vision to succeed.

After setting standards for student performance, which may either be confined to academic competencies or extend to civic and work-related skills, attention must be given to formulating frameworks and guidelines that link curriculum to the standards. "Expectations for what students should know and be able to do should cross subject areas and support active learning, not passive memorization, and critical thinking," states another ECS publication (1992b).

Standards, if carefully designed and implemented, can have many benefits, including: (1) providing the common base that makes reform meaningful, (2) protecting the economic health and competitiveness of the nation, (3) reflecting a common core of learning and contributing to a sense of community, (4) reinforcing attention to equity, and (5) serving as a tool to judge how well education systems are performing (ECS 1992a). To ensure that standards achieve their intended purpose, they should be broad enough to allow teacher flexibility; if adopted at the national or state level, they should be personalized to reflect local reform efforts; and they should encourage, not stifle, creative teaching methods (1992a).

Outcome-Based Assessment

Assessment strategies used in conjunction with "learner outcomes" focus on the ability of students to demonstrate mastery of knowledge and skills through such methods as exhibitions and portfolios. This method of assessment contrasts sharply with merely tallying students' credit hours in various academic areas before placing a diploma in their hands.

Conley (1993) stresses that it is important for educators to develop new performance outcomes prior to implementing new approaches to measurement. Otherwise, he states, "If old outcomes are retained while new assessments are adopted, the result will likely be old wine in new skins; changing measurement techniques will not

alter outcomes if teachers still believe implicitly that they are seeking to achieve existing educational goals." Defining new outcomes before moving on to assessment also helps to ensure that the instructional program is driving—and not driven by—the desired outcomes (Conley).

It is important for schools to develop ways of assessing their own performance as well as the performance of students, emphasizes Darling-Hammond (1992). If standards are set for students, schools must be in a position to help students attain the desired level of performance. Unfortunately, states Darling-Hammond, "the rush to the outcome-based approach has often [left] schools hanging without the resources to get there." School standards can serve as an incentive for improving practice, particularly if they don't unduly restrict the options available to school personnel in their trek toward improved performance, and if the state issues an annual "report card" that gives the public an indication of how the school is faring in its efforts.

Site-Based Management

Instituting site-based management is one way some schools are departing from traditional practice. This innovation, often associated with restructuring, changes the roles of those involved in the educational process by shifting the locus of decision-making authority from school boards, superintendents, and central-office administrators to individual schools. The rationale behind site-based management is that when those charged with making decisions are close to the actual delivery of educational services, the decisions will be more appropriate than if primary decision-making power is in the hands of individuals who are far removed from, and often out of touch with, needs at the school level (Hill and Bonan 1991).

In site-based schools, management consists largely of a process whereby principals, teachers, and community members identify needs and then coordinate efforts to meet those needs. For site-based management to be effective, however, it is not merely schools that must change how they operate; the structures, operations, and cultures of school boards and central offices must undergo change as well (Hill and Bonan). The issue of accountability must be handled differently than in school districts where decision-making is centrally based.

New Conceptions of Grade and School Organization

Other innovations associated with restructuring efforts include redesigning the curriculum so that learners can be actively involved in constructing meaning, adopting a more integrative approach to education, and reconceptualizing assessment as an integral part of the teaching/learning process. The learning environment is also being redefined, with experimentation occurring in areas such as nongraded classrooms, team learning, interdisciplinary instruction, out-of-classroom learning experiences, and alternatives to tracking (George 1992). And technology is central to many restructuring plans, as is parent and community involvement (Amster and others 1990).

Many schools undergoing restructuring are adopting new learning models in which different combinations of adults and children interact inside and outside the four walls of the classroom (Ratzki and Fisher 1989-90). Modifications are also being made in how time is divided during the school day, with the duration and frequency of classes being reexamined, and changes taking place in the length of the school day and year.

One innovation mentioned above—nongraded education—is generating exceptional interest. Nongraded education is the practice of teaching children of different age and ability levels together in the same classroom, without dividing them or the curriculum into steps labeled by grade designations (Gaustad, March 1992). Related concepts are "continuous progress" (as opposed to annual promotions), "multiage grouping," "open education," and "developmentally appropriate education."

Although some of these concepts were implemented without much success in the 1960s, research in child development and learning during the past two decades has given nongraded education a much stronger foundation. Today nongraded education at the primary level carries

the endorsement of the National Association of State Boards of Education, the National Association of Elementary School Principals, and the National Association for the Education of Young Children. Nongraded education is also one component of comprehensive education reform legislation in a handful of states. The Canadian province of British Columbia and the state of Kentucky have mandated a changeover to nongraded education. Oregon is considering a mandate. In addition, many schools and school districts across the nation are adapting their curricula to the nongraded model. Although most programs are confined to the primary level, some extend through grades 5 or 6, and British Columbia's program goes all the way through high school.

Prerequisites for Change

Although many schools are jumping on the restructuring bandwagon, efforts to restructure schools may be destined to fail unless there is greater awareness of how organizational change occurs and adequate attention is given to conditions within schools that tend to work against restructuring efforts (Tye 1992). It is not sufficient to merely rearrange the structure of ineffective organizations. If special efforts are not made to help members adopt and institutionalize new behaviors—a piece of the restructuring puzzle that is often overlooked—changes will be short-lived because members will carry with them into the new structure many of their old, comfortable habits and routines (Tye).

Long-term training must be offered for everyone who participates in the system. In the case of schools, key players who will need long-term assistance in instituting new behaviors include "legislators, state and district superintendents, school board members, principals, teachers, and parents."

The question of who really has authority is an issue that often surfaces in relation to restructuring. As Tye points out, "just when the restructuring movement is calling for more decision-making authority to be invested at the school level, the reality is that educational decision making is more 'top down' and hierarchical than it has ever been." He contends that not much energy has gone into considering how to help state and district board members make the transition from directing to serving and supporting. In addition, many unanswered questions remain about how calls for a national curriculum and national testing can coexist with local control of schools and site-based decision-making (Tye).

Reformers must also guard against other unintended byproducts of restructuring efforts. In the course of restructuring, teachers are often burdened with a host of new responsibilities and charged with performing competently in new roles such as "instructional coach, curriculum team member, entrepreneur to build new programs, student advisor/confidant, and participant in organizational decision-making" (Newmann and Clune). But curriculum and instruction may suffer as teachers begin to devote more of their attention to governance, collaborative interaction with peers and administrators, and meeting students' needs for social support.

Corporate Involvement

In addition to changes that are occurring in the way reform is conceptualized and implemented, new faces are also appearing on the front lines of educational reform. Recently there has been a significant upsurge in corporate involvement in educational reform (Noble 1992). For example, CEOs from a number of powerful multinational corporations sit on the board of the New American Schools Development Corporation (NASDC), established by the Bush Administration to funnel corporate funds into innovative designs for "new American schools." In May 1992, after reviewing hundreds of submissions, the NASDC board funded a handful of proposals for models of replicable, "world class" schools. "Given the enormous sums involved, these selections promise to shape the direction of educational research, development and policy for years to come," states Noble.

Although some applaud partnerships that are springing up between schools and the business community, others advise educators to take a close look at the explicit and implicit motives that may underlie corporate involvement in educational reform. Critics suggest that to a large

extent corporations are merely attempting to bolster their image through such involvement. In addition, they caution that CEOs may strive to reshape education in the image of the corporate world, advocating competition and productivity as antidotes to educational failure simply because "that's the only game they know" (Noble).

Amster, Jeanne, and others. *Investing in Our Future: The Imperatives of Education Reform and the Role of Business*. Aspen Institute, 1990. 43 pages. ED 323 327.

Conley, David. *Roadmap to Restructuring: Policies, Practices, and the Emerging Visions of Schooling*. Eugene, Oregon: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, University of Oregon, 1993. 432 pages.

_____. *Five Key Issues in School Restructuring*. ERIC Digest Series. Eugene, Oregon: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, University of Oregon, 1992. 2 pages. ED 344 329.

Darling-Hammond, Linda. "Reframing the School Reform Agenda: Developing Capacity for School Transformation." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, California, April 1992.

_____. "Standards of Practice for Learner-Centered Schools." New York: National Center for Restructuring Education, Schools, and Teaching, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1991.

Education Commission of the States. *Creating Visions and Standards to Support Them. Restructuring the Education System*. Denver, Colorado: ECS, 1992a. ED 350 676.

_____. *Introduction to Systemic Education Reform: Restructuring the Education System*. Denver, Colorado: ECS, 1992b.

Gaustad, Joan. *Making the Transition from Graded to Nongraded Primary Education*. Eugene, Oregon: Oregon School Study Council, University of Oregon, April 1992. 41 pages. ED 343 282.

_____. *Nongraded Education: Mixed-Age, Integrated, and Developmentally Appropriate Education for Primary Children*. Eugene, Oregon: Oregon School Study Council, University of Oregon, March 1992. 41 pages. ED 343 227.

George, Paul. *How to Untrack Your School*. Alexandria, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1992. 44 pages. ED 348 752.

Hill, Paul T., and Josephine Bonan. *Decentralization and Accountability in Public Education*. Santa Monica, California: RAND Corporation, 1991. ED 334 665.

Newmann, Fred M., and William H. Clune. *When School Restructuring Meets Systemic Curriculum Reform*. Brief to Policymakers Series. Madison, Wisconsin: Center on Organization and Restructuring of Schools, 1992. ED 348 711.

Noble, Douglas D. "New American Schools and the New World Order." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, California, April 1992. ED 348 715.

Olson, Lynn. "Fed Up with Tinkering, Reformers Now Touting 'Systemic' Approach." *Education Week* (September 9, 1992): 1, 30.

Peterson, Kent D., and Janet S. Bixby. *Support for School Restructuring: The Work of National Organizations*. Madison, Wisconsin: Center on Organization and Restructuring of Schools, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1992. ED 345 386.

Ratzki, Anne, and Angela Fisher. "Life in a Restructured School." *Educational Leadership* 46, 4 (December-January 1989-90): 46-51. EJ 400 500.

Rebarber, Theodor. *State Policies for School Restructurin:. Better Education through Informed Legislation Series*. Denver, Colorado: National Conference of State Legislatures, 1992. 33 pages. ED 345 366.

Sashkin, Marshall, and John Egermeier. "School Change Models and Processes: A Review of Research and Practice." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, August 1992. 22 pages. ED 348 758.

Tye, Kenneth A. "Restructuring Our Schools: Beyond the Rhetoric." *Phi Delta Kappan* (September 1992: 8-14. EJ 449 869.

Evolving Patterns of Governance

Over the past several years, the number of players who have their fingers in the school governance pie has been growing. Federal and state governments, school boards, central-office administrators, personnel at individual schools, and members of the private sector are all exercising influence in educational decision-making. Currently, traditional boundaries of responsibility in the area of educational decision-making are being redrawn, with the territory of some parties expanding while the ground held by others is diminishing.

Federal Involvement

Historically, the federal government has maintained a "hands off" policy in regard to education. It wasn't until the 1960s—when it attempted to equalize opportunity for students by offering programs such as Head Start and Follow Through, and to equalize achievement through Chapter 1—that the federal government began to exert some control over schools. However, this pattern seems to be changing. On the premise of preserving "national security," a legitimate concern of the federal government, more intervention may occur during the 1990s as evidence mounts that international economic competitiveness is related to educational achievement (Conley 1993).

The federal government is increasing its efforts to monitor the quality of education in each of the fifty states. A push to set national education goals and standards was publicly launched in 1990 by then President Bush when he, in concert with state governors, outlined six "America 2000" goals for education They are: (1) All students will start school each day prepared to learn; (2) the high school graduation rate will be at least 90 percent by the year 2000; (3) students will show demonstrated competency in challenging subject matter at the conclusion of grades 4, 8, and 12; (4) American students will be top in the world in math and science; (5) every adult will be literate and be equipped with the knowledge and skills to function in a global economy; and (6) every school will be drug free and violence free and will maintain a climate that fosters learning.

State Involvement

Over the past several years, many states have been flexing their regulatory muscles by exercising more control over public education systems. During the past decade in particular, state regulation has crept into areas previously considered the domain of local or federal policymakers (Consortium for Policy Research in Education 1992). According to Ravitch (1990), what we have witnessed is a "shift of major proportion [in which] the locus of educational policy-making moved . . . to the states."

Changes that have occurred in the area of teacher salary decisions illustrate this shift. Whereas before the mid 1980s the task of setting starting salaries for teachers was usually delegated to districts, by 1986 at least thirty states had set minimum salaries for teachers. State-level involvement has also risen in relation to curriculum. States now set policies regarding required courses and instructional time to be devoted various subject areas; the job of specifying academic skills that must be tested is also often performed by state officials.

Regulation at the state level can be divided into three categories, depending on what is targeted—school inputs, processes, or outputs (CPRE). Inputs include policies relating to resources, such as setting spending limits and minimum teacher qualifications. Regulations pertaining to educational processes include those that affect the organization and delivery of instruction, such as class size, subjects to be taught, and grade-level organization. Educational outputs over which states may have some jurisdiction include setting standards for student performance and establishing graduation require-

ments. Concern about the growth of state regulation has caused many policymakers to begin considering how they can concentrate their efforts on outcomes and curb their regulation of processes so that schools will have more freedom to determine how best to achieve the specified outcomes.

Increased state regulation of schooling has stirred up controversy and "increased complaints about the constraining nature of state rules" (CPRE). As some perceive local control to be slipping away, the types of regulatory power exerted at the state level are being looked at more closely. For example, a number of states exempt some schools and districts from specific regulations, which allows state officials to concentrate their attention on overseeing the schools that are having considerable difficulty complying with state regulations. Exempting certain schools from certain regulations also is intended to give schools more flexibility. But this state response, in turn, has ignited further debate about the purposes and effects of regulation of education by the state (CPRE). As one publication laments, "Not only are [regulatory] standards likely to be minimal, but efforts to verify conformance to the standards are also likely to be minimal" (CPRE). Concern has been voiced that mandates issued by the state may inadvertently have the effect of lowering expectations for practice.

Some of those advocating "systemic" reform in schools argue that states need to rethink teaching, learning, and governance simultaneously. According to Olson (October 1992), "States need to develop learning goals for students, based on a broad public consensus, and then adopt policies on student assessments, instructional materials, teacher training and licensure, and funding that are aligned and coordinated." Within this framework, states would then give schools a great deal of latitude in determining organizational structure, what is taught, and how it is taught.

One problem at the state level is that individual legislative committees often act independently, pursuing their individual goals without consulting each other (Olson). Cohesiveness and coordination among policies are often absent at the state level, in part because turf-consciousness and the role of special-interest groups loom large in educational politics. Even if coordination of policies is achieved at the state level, care must be taken to see that policies are not at odds with existing federal mandates or district practices.

School Board Involvement

The political role of the school board has changed significantly since it was first established. Initially intended to ensure that community values were communicated to students and money raised through taxes was used properly, the role of school boards is now undergoing an identity crisis of sorts. "As the educational landscape shifts," note Olson and Bradley (1992), "most agree that the roles and responsibilities of school boards cannot possibly remain static." When people begin to make predictions about the future role of school boards, however, consensus crumbles as ideas begin to diverge. Some believe only minor modifications are needed in the way school boards function and how their role is defined, while others call for massive changes or suggest that school boards should be discarded completely.

The most ardent critics characterize lay local governance of education as superfluous, dysfunctional, or obsolete. Many in this camp believe it is futile to try to redefine the role of boards. These critics view boards as an unnecessary form of "middle management"; they suggest that it would make more sense to do away with districts and their boards of education and have states work directly with individual schools (Olson, April 1992). Adherents of this position often assert that school boards generally function as puppets who unquestioningly swallow what they are spoonfed by the educational establishment, thereby helping to further solidify the status quo and eschewing reform. Thomas A. Shannon, executive director of the National School Boards Association, refutes this. The charge that school boards stand in the way of reform is totally unsubstantiated, claims Shannon. It is his belief that critics are merely attempting to make school boards the scapegoats for educational ills (Olson and Bradley).

Even if they don't buy into critics' claims, most people acknowledge that school boards today find themselves in a bind as their sover-

eignty is being challenged from both above and below. As state control over education has grown, boards have become increasingly concerned about the involvement of state policymakers in what members consider local issues. At the same time, as more schools move toward site-based management and begin to assume responsibility for everything from budgets to curricula, school boards are no longer free to assume the role that is probably most familiar to them—direct management (Olson and Bradley).

A prevalent criticism aimed at boards is that they have become stuck in the mire of minutiae and spend little time attending to broad educational issues and long-range planning. Some claim that boards "have lost their internal compass: the clarity of vision and purpose needed to steer an organization" (Olson and Bradley). To avoid becoming bogged down by administrative details, a few boards—spurred in some cases by state legislation—are starting to function as "boards of directors"; their focus is on helping to set a general direction for the school and subsequently reviewing plans, goals, and outcomes that are set for different parts of the organization (Conley). To rid board members of any tendency to relapse into a micromanagement mentality, nearly all other types of decisions are diverted to administrative personnel in the district, primarily the superintendent and members of his or her staff. Conley claims that this redefinition of school board responsibility can be accomplished without serious repercussions as long as community appeal processes are in place, as is the case in most school districts.

Other suggested tonics to make the existing system of school board governance more viable include setting stricter criteria for who can serve on school boards; making training for school board members mandatory; putting a cap on the number of times school boards can meet; combining school board elections with general elections to increase voter participation in the election of board members; returning to at-large elections instead of using a selection process in which members are chosen by precinct; and utilizing "masters," people outside of education who have expertise and experience in educational policy, to help local boards find solutions to the problems they face (Olson, April 1992).

Central-Office Involvement

According to Conley, "there may be no other group whose role could be affected more profoundly by many of the potential changes in roles than central-office administrators." Traditionally, the administrative structure of school districts has been based largely upon models operating in the private sector and the military that are built on a strongly hierarchical framework. A belief prevailed that educational processes could be governed much like manufacturing processes. Just about the time that districts were becoming adept at implementing centralized authority systems, however, the private sector began to move in a new direction, embracing ideas such as decentralized decision-making, employee involvement, and participatory management.

In the coming years, a primary function of administrators in the central office may be to serve as facilitators, supporting or enabling other personnel to solve problems or achieve organizational goals on their own. The central office may also play a larger role in helping districts and schools to establish a clear identity and formulate a sense of direction and purpose. In addition, central-office administrators will play a key role in setting standards and outcomes for performance and then assessing whether individual school buildings are actually "getting the job done."

School-Site Involvement

In some districts, more aspects of management and governance are being shifted to the school site. When schools move toward decentralized management and governance patterns, the reverberations are significant. Change takes place not only in the responsibilities transferred to the school level; significant shifts also occur in norms, roles, and decision-making power.

When principals of schools involved in school-based management were surveyed, they noted that a number of norms operate "to a significantly greater degree at their schools than at the schools operating with a traditional governance system" (Drolet 1992). The fifteen norms principals in the study identified as playing a

larger role in SBM schools than in traditional schools fell into three categories: staff empowerment, team building, and conflict management. "Just as a carpenter must first secure a strong foundation for a new house before the building process begins, educators must build a strong infrastructure or foundation for a new governance system," states Drolet. "While not easily visible, the norms of an organization form the foundation of reforms such as school-based management."

Private-Sector Involvement

Whereas in the past the government's role as direct funder and provider of public education went largely unquestioned, this is no longer so. Today, as a variety of new approaches to education are being tried, the government's right to exclusively occupy the provider role is being challenged (Olson, October 1992). Instead of being seen as a vehicle for solving the nation's problems, government is perceived by many Americans in a decidedly negative light, even as a barrier to solutions (Rist 1992). A commonly held belief is that the private sector tends to have a higher success rate when it comes to achieving desired results than does a governmental bureaucracy. However, if efficiency is viewed as the ultimate goal, issues of fairness and equity are likely to be compromised as they become relegated to low rungs on the priority ladder (Rist).

Private and quasi-private alternatives to what some see as the entrenched public school bureaucracy have been gradually gaining acceptance. Some corporations are underwriting efforts to redesign schools. Others are investing in the development of for-profit schools that will compete head-to-head with public schools. For example, instead of trying to "fix" existing schools, Whittle Communications plans a 2.5 billion-dollar undertaking meant to produce a chain of K-12 for-profit schools by 1995; the overarching goal of these schools will be to outperform public and non-profit schools by turning out a better "product" (Darling-Hammond 1992). The aim of the project, according to entrepreneur Christopher Whittle, is to create schools so powerful and innovative that they will stimulate modifications in the structure of America's public education system. But many ethical dilemmas arise when the element of profit is introduced into the picture. Especially during tough economic times, cutting costs and saving money is viewed by the public as a priority. However, as Darling-Hammond notes, "Pursuing profits while pursuing the public's broader goals for children's education creates an unavoidable conflict of interest."

Conley, David T. *Roadmap to Restructuring: Policies, Practices, and the Emerging Visions of Schooling*. Eugene, Oregon: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, University of Oregon, 1993. 432 pages.

Consortium for Policy Research in Education. "Ten Lessons About Regulation and Schooling." CPRE Policy Brief. New Brunswick, New Jersey: author, 1992. ED 348 729.

Darling-Hammond, Linda. "For-Profit Schooling: Where's the Public Good?" *Education Week* XII, 5 (October 7, 1992): 40.

Drolet, Bonita. "Before You Restructure. . ." *Thrust for Educational Leadership* 22, 2 (October 1992): 14-17.

Olson, Lynn. "New Approaches Blurring the Line Between Public and Private Schools." *Education Week* XII, 5 (October 7, 1992): 1, 18-20.

_____. "Up for Discussion." *Education Week Special Report* XI, (April 29, 1992): 23-25, 27-28.

Olson, Lynn, and Ann Bradley. "Boards of Contention." *Education Week Special Report* XI, (April 29, 1992): 2-3, 5, 7, 9-10.

Ravitch, Diane. "Education in the 1980's: A Concern for 'Quality'." *Education Week* IX, 17 (1990): 33, 48.

Rist, Ray C. "Wanted: A New Kind of Government." *The American School Board Journal* (July 1992): 36, 38.

Leadership: The Changing Principal's Role

The 1990s are proving to be a time of productive ferment for the theory and practice of school leadership. From the halls of academy to school district offices, from think tanks to meetings of citizen advisory councils, the role of the principal is being reexamined to bring the position in line with the rapidly changing policy and organizational context of schools. Many of the forces that are reshaping this societal context have a global reach: the increasing importance of education in the information age, the growing competition in the world marketplace, the changing demographics highlighted in an earlier section, the worldwide trend toward grassroots democracy, the disillusionment with bureaucratic organizations, and the devolution of authority to local levels of problem-solving (Murphy and Hallinger 1992).

In not only the U.S. but many other nations as well, these reform pressures are giving rise to school restructuring efforts that emphasize decentralization, including such options as deregulation, open enrollment, school-based management, and local accountability for outcomes (Murphy and Hallinger). The implications for the nature of school leadership are profound. Principals "are being asked to undergo a metamorphosis, to change from transactional to transformational leaders" (Murphy and Hallinger).

Background of Principal's Role

During the 1980s, principals were increasingly viewed as crucial to educational reform efforts. Education authorities attempted to reform the principalship in an image consistent with popular effective-schooling notions (Hallinger 1992). The principal became the primary source of knowledge about educational program development and was expected to intervene directly with teachers to improve instruction. The principal was responsible for setting high expectations for teachers and students, monitoring classroom instruction and student progress, and coordinating the school curriculum (Hallinger and Murphy 1986, Cawelti 1987, Gibbs 1989). Other characteristics of effective instructional leaders included the ability to develop a clear vision, shape school culture, and motivate students and teachers toward desirable goals (Renchler 1991, Cawelti 1987).

Just as the instructional-leadership image appeared to be gaining wide acceptance, it began to be questioned. Practitioners and researchers alike expressed concern about the everyday demands of the principalship and the problems of balancing instructional and other managerial responsibilities. Also, the effective-schools movement began to draw criticism for its simplistic, prescriptive approach; overblown research claims; focus on narrow educational outcomes; and promotion of authoritarian techniques (Cuban 1984, Grady and others 1989). As Hallinger points out, policy-makers and program developers "unwittingly relied on their own assumptions and beliefs as they mapped the process most conducive to school improvement." Policy-making was top-down, and the principal's primary role was *managing* an externally devised reform effort. Moreover, the instructional-leadership role seemed incompatible with "emerging conceptions of teacher leadership and professionalism" (Hallinger 1992).

As demands for changes in school organization, professional roles, and public education intensified, reformers began to advocate decentralization of curricular and instructional decision-making authority from the school district to the school site. Although school-based management did not necessarily require principals to share decision-making responsibility, the movement generally succeeded in expanding teacher

(and parent) participation and in reconceptualizing the principal's role. Shared decision-making required a more facilitative, collaborative, even transformative approach to school leadership that could increase teacher responsibility and accountability without undermining the principal's authority (Hallinger 1992).

Since the late 1980s, a growing body of research has corroborated the value of collaborative and team-management approaches to school improvement and extolled their many benefits, such as increased collegiality, information-sharing, and student cooperation (David and others 1989, Smith and Scott 1990). Recent literature has focused on school-based management's shortcomings in influencing student achievement, due to inadequate planning, piecemeal implementation, and insufficient time for changes to occur (Malen and associates 1990, White 1989).

Other research examines conflicts and confusions arising from teacher involvement in decision-making, stressing the need for establishing common ground and clear lines of responsibility (Weiss and others 1992). Another study examining principals' perceptions of school restructuring shows that "even professionals who view themselves as supporters of fundamental reform may be severely limited by their own experience, training, and beliefs in bringing about a new order of schools" (Hallinger, Murphy, and Hausman 1992).

Promise of Transformational Leadership

Despite the drawbacks of imperfectly implemented participative-management systems, the transformational-leadership concept (developed by James McGregor Burns in 1978) may offer the most promising approach to school leadership. Whereas instructional leadership generally encompasses a top-down, hierarchical arrangement endowing the principal with expert status, and transactional leadership involves bartering for services and rewards, transformational leadership emphasizes consensual or facilitative power manifested through, instead of over, others (Leithwood 1992). Teachers become the true instructional leaders, and principals are charged with developing and encouraging teachers' leadership abilities. An entire school community defines its vision of learning and teaching and becomes empowered and energized to achieve it.

For the transformational leader, some of the most important skills are interpersonal: to promote staff ownership of change, to develop a leadership team, to manage decision-making in group settings, and to build community support for the school.

Transformative leaders pursue three goals: helping staff develop and maintain a collaborative, professional school culture; fostering teacher development; and helping teachers solve problems more effectively. According to Leithwood's own studies, transformational-leadership practices greatly influence teacher collaboration, and significant relationships exist between aspects of transformational leadership and teachers' own reports of attitude changes regarding school improvement and instructional behaviors.

How readily might the nation's school principals accept this transition to a different style of leadership? Hallinger sees evidence that educators continue to adhere to the 1980s instructional-leadership model while adapting it to the requirements of shared decision-making. "Already," he writes, "many effective school-based leadership development programs have discovered ways to reconcile the *strong leader* imagery of effective schools with the transformational notions inherent in school restructuring. In this way schools will continue to respond vigorously to changing normative expectations, while at the same time limiting the erosion of traditional notions of schooling and leadership" (Hallinger 1992).

Along with explorations of transformational leadership, students of leadership are probing beneath organizational surfaces to discover the innerlife and meaning of leadership behavior (Sergiovanni 1991). Patricia Tucker-Ladd (1992) emphasizes the importance of values, purposes, symbols, and meaning underlying transformational and collaborative leadership approaches.

A related development is the adaptation of Japanese management techniques, embodied in W. Edwards Deming's fourteen Total Quality

Management principles, to school settings. Focusing on customer satisfaction, employee empowerment, product quality, and an environment promoting unity and change, TQM has exciting implications for radically changing the roles of administrators, teachers, and educators and revamping assessment methods (Olson 1992, Rhodes 1992, and Blankenstein 1992). Further research is needed to determine the effects of TQM.

Blankstein, Alan M. "Lessons from Enlightened Corporations." *Educational Leadership* 49, 6 (March 1992): 71-75. EJ 441 180.

Cawelti, Gordon. "How Effective Instructional Leaders Get Results." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association of School Administrators, New Orleans, Louisiana, February 20-23, 1987. 18 pages. ED 328 935.

Cuban, Larry. "Transforming the Frog into a Prince: Effective Schools Research, Policy and Practice at the District Level." *Harvard Educational Review* 54, 2 (May 1984): 129-51. EJ 299 040.

David, Jane L., and others. *Restructuring in Progress: Lessons from Pioneering Districts. Results in Education Series*. Washington, DC: Center for Policy Research in Education; National Governors' Association, 1989. 60 pages. ED 306 633.

Gibbs, Greg K. "Effective Schools Research: The Principal as Instructional Leader. With Annotated Bibliography," 1989. 22 pages. ED 308 587.

Grady, Marilyn, and others. *A Review of Effective Schools Research as It Relates to Effective Principals. UCEA Monograph Series*. Tempe, Arizona: University Council for Educational Administration, 1989. 31 pages. ED 304 743.

Hallinger, Philip. "The Evolving Role of American Principals: From Managerial to Instructional to Transformational Leaders." *Journal of Educational Administration* 30, 3 (1992): 35-48. EJ 449 891.

Hallinger, Philip, and Joseph Murphy. "Instructional Leadership in Effective Schools." 1986. 14 pages. ED 309 535.

Hallinger, Philip, and others. "Conceptualizing School Restructuring: Principals' and Teachers' Perceptions." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, April 20-24, 1992. ED 345 355.

Leithwood, Kenneth A. "The Move Toward Transformational Leadership." *Educational Leadership* 49, 5 (February 1992): 8-12. EJ 439 275.

Malen, Betty, and others. "Unfulfilled Promises." *School Administrator* 47, 2 (February 1990): 30-32, 53-56, 59. EJ 402 409.

Murphy, Joseph, and Philip Hallinger. "The Principalship in an Era of Transformation." *Journal of Educational Administration* 30, 3 (1992): 77-88. EJ 449 894.

Olson, Lynn. "Quality-Management Movement Spurs Interest in New Awards for Education." *Education Week* 11, 26 (March 18, 1992): 8.

Renchler, Ron. *Leadership with a Vision: How Principals Develop and Implement Their Visions for School Success*. Eugene, Oregon: Oregon School Study Council, 1991. 45 pages. ED 328 976.

Rhodes, Lewis A. "On the Road to Quality." *Educational Leadership* 49, 6 (March 1992): 76-80. EJ 441 181.

Sergiovanni, Thomas. "Constructing and Changing Theories of Practice: The Key to Preparing School Administrators." *Urban Review* 23, 1 (March 1991): 39-49. EJ 427 943.

Smith, Stuart C., and James J. Scott. *The Collaborative School: A Work Environment for Effective Instruction*. Eugene, Oregon: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, 1990. 77 pages. ED 316 918.

Stronge, James H. "Managing for Productive Schools: The Principals's Role in Contemporary Education." *NASSP Bulletin* 74, 524 (March 1990): 1-5. EJ 405 116.

Thompson, Scott. "Dimensions of School Leadership." *Texas Study of Secondary Education Research Journal* 43 (Fall 1988): 1-17. EJ 396 513.

Tucker-Ladd, Patricia. "School Leadership: Encouraging Leaders for Change." *Educational Administration Quarterly* 28, 3 (August 1992): 397-409. EJ 447 160.

Weiss, Carol H., and others. "Trouble in Paradise: Teacher Conflicts in Shared Decision Making." *Educational Administration Quarterly* 28, 3 (August 1992): 350-67. EJ 447 157.

White, Paula A. "An Overview of School-Based Management: What Does the Research Say?" *NASSP Bulletin* 73, 518 (September 1989): 1-8. EJ 396 494.

Training and Selection of School Administrators

Administrative personnel issues will remain prominent throughout the 1990s, a decade in which about half of the nation's 100,000 school principals will retire and need to be replaced. The imminent need to train, recruit, select, and induct some 50,000 school leaders has important implications for both preservice and inservice administrator-preparation programs, as well as for school district personnel offices. Accordingly, for the past several years, preservice training of principals has been receiving increased attention—and criticism—from scholars, national commissions, and principals themselves.

Five years ago, the National Committee on Excellence in Educational Administration noted "troubling aspects throughout the field," such as a lack of leader recruitment programs in the schools, a lack of minorities and women in the field, a lack of systematic professional development for school leaders, a lack of quality candidates for preparation programs, a lack of preparation programs relevant to the job demands of school administrators, and a lack of a national sense of cooperation in preparing school leaders. The commission recommended that a National Policy Board for Educational Administration should be established, that administrator-preparation programs should be modeled after those in other professional schools, and that licensure programs should be substantially reformed (University Council for Educational Administration 1987).

In 1989, the newly formed National Policy Board for Educational Administration issued its agenda for the reform of school-administrator-preparation programs. Its recommendations focus on raising standards for admittance to preparation programs, requiring a doctorate in educational administration for principals and superintendents, requiring one year each of academic residency and field residency, and creating sites for clinical study and field residency through formal partnerships between universities and school districts. The board also recommended creation of a national certification examination that candidates would have to pass to receive a license (NPBEA 1989). Many of these same reforms are the subject of a more recent NPBEA report titled *A Blueprint for Change* (1992). In the preface, Scott Thomson, the board's executive director, notes that educators, opinion leaders, and political officials have reached "a near consensus" about the need for change.

Theory-Practice Dichotomy

A longstanding problem has been the weak connection between theory and practice. The knowledge base of those who train school administrators has been organized along the lines of the academic disciplines (social sciences), whereas the knowledge base of the school administrator must respond to professional problems. Some encouraging signs that the field is seriously addressing this "clinical gap" between the classroom and practice are becoming evident.

In cooperation with the National Commission for the Principalship (1990), the NPBEA released *Principals for Our Changing Schools: Preparation and Certification*, which defined twenty-one domains that constitute a new knowledge and skill base for the principalship.

In January 1993, the NPBEA released a 570-page loose-leaf notebook that details a comprehensive program for principal preparation. Titled *Principals for Our Changing Schools: The Knowledge and Skills Base*, the document is based on three years of research concerning "what principals need to know and need to be able to do" in the 1990s. Intended as a "new structure by which to organize the principalship," the curriculum is built upon the twenty-one performance domains issued in 1990; it identifies many skills that are not ordinarily taught in traditional principal preparation programs and

describes how principals can acquire these skills.

According to the preface, the publication "describes, in selected fashion, the foundation blocks of a program of studies for elementary, middle and high school principals." It is intended to "serve as the central template for preparation, inservice, or certification programs." A fundamental assumption is that a training program using this template must give students ample exposure to simulations, scenarios and case studies, direct observation, mentorships, and other field work if the integration of knowledge and skills is to occur.

Several university training programs have begun to organize their curricula around the NPBEA's domains, which serve as a blueprint. The board is also encouraging state certification bodies to utilize the domains in creating a two-level performance-based approach to certification. The first level would be the obtaining of a license for entry to the profession, and the second level would require the demonstration of advanced knowledge and skills in order to receive professional certification. Several states, such as Tennessee and Florida, currently utilize a two-tier licensure program for principals.

Independently of the NPBEA, a number of departments of educational administration have developed preparation programs for principals and superintendents that incorporate school/university partnerships, clinical activities, field work, and problem-based learning. Anderson (1991) describes promising training strategies in these areas that are based in both universities and school districts. The University Council for Educational Administration has been active in encouraging university training programs to adopt problem-based, clinical components. Individual professors are also experimenting with new curricula based on problems of practice.

Edwin M. Bridges (1992) describes his experience in Stanford University's Prospective Principals' Program with problem-based learning, an approach in which students, working in groups, take responsibility for solving professional problems. Problem-based learning not only focuses students' attention on the actual problems they will face on the job, but also requires them to integrate knowledge from all the disciplines. This method complements the traditional curriculum, which dissects professional practice into subdisciplines such as school law, personnel, and supervision.

Another effort to define the proficiencies of school principals was undertaken by the National Association of Elementary School Principals (1991). NAESP's proficiencies form much of the content for the nation's first alternative certification program for principals operated by a professional organization—the Massachusetts Elementary School Principals Association (Olson 1991).

Murphy and Hallinger (1992) note that the restructuring movement, particularly the increase in school-based group decision-making efforts, places a premium on principals' need for group-process skills. In addition to these skills, however, they advocate a continuing focus on instructional leadership, because "even in a context where leadership responsibilities are shared, the principal needs a firm grounding in education in order to lead change efforts effectively" (Murphy and Hallinger).

To identify and train competent administrators, some districts have already begun programs that assist in identifying future leaders among their teacher corps so that those individuals can be trained to step into administrative positions when they are vacated. Many districts have sought the help of faculty members at nearby colleges or universities to provide inservice development for prospective and newly hired school administrators. As an example of a different approach, the Centennial School District in Portland, Oregon, operates a leadership-development program whose instructors have been selected from the district's corps of experienced, competent administrators; thus they can impart to their trainees (chosen from among the classroom teachers who volunteered for the program) the skills and philosophy unique to the administration of that particular district.

Professional Development

On-the-job professional development opportunities have proliferated in recent years. In the last ten years, many states have added requirements that practicing administrators complete a certain number of inservice courses over a period

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

of years (Hallinger and Murphy 1992). Much of the experimentation in this field has centered around approaches that further collaborative inquiry. The Peer-Assisted Leadership (PAL) program developed by the Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development is one such approach, through which participants receive validation, renewal, and support in a year-long program of nonevaluative peer observation and reflection (Lee 1991).

Mentorship programs link beginning school administrators with experienced colleagues who provide assistance with professional growth and are on call to answer questions and offer constructive feedback about job performance (Pence 1989).

Several universities and regional associations of principals operate principals' centers (sometimes called academies or institutes) that allow principals to meet in a collegial setting to share skills and practices and to take part in meetings, audio- and tele-conferences, and workshops. Several centers provide external support systems, including toll-free hotlines for assistance and feedback.

Principal Selection

In the area of principal selection, Anderson notes studies suggesting that school districts often do not hire the best candidates. He recommends that school districts develop written policies, create a pool of qualified candidates, develop specific selection criteria, write specific vacancy announcements, recruit widely, involve a broad base of people in screening and selection, train those who select principals, use multiple means of assessment, and consider varied sources of information about candidates.

A widely used approach for identifying and screening prospective candidates is the assessment center, conceived by the National Association of Secondary School Principals in 1975. The assessment center helps districts identify the strengths and weaknesses of potential principals in such job-related areas as problem analysis, decisiveness, sensitivity, and oral and written communication. The network of local, regional, and state assessment centers includes a total of 58 centers that have trained more than 6,000 assessors and served more than 11,000 potential administrators (Hersey 1992). At the University of Oregon's experimental preparation program in school administration, participants' strengths and weaknesses in human-relations skills are diagnosed in an assessment center prior to an internship (Schmuck 1993).

School Business Officials

As in the case of school administrators, a wholesale turnover of school business officials is expected to take place during the next several years as a large number reach retirement age. A factor leading to a shortage of qualified business managers is that school districts must compete with the private sector, which is able to pay higher salaries and offers positions having higher prestige and better advancement opportunities.

To fill vacant positions, many smaller districts are having to promote bookkeepers and clerical employees, who are ill trained to run the districts' financial operations. Consequently, increasing numbers of districts are encountering financial difficulties caused by inefficient budgeting, accounting, and fiscal-management procedures.

Some states, such as California, are launching statewide inservice training programs for business managers. Smaller states, such as Oregon, rely on the informal assistance that experienced business managers provide for their beginning colleagues; such assistance is usually coordinated by the state department of education or the state affiliate of the Association of School Business Officials (ASBO).

Responding to the concern that about 60 percent of the states and Canadian provinces have no certification requirements for school business officials, ASBO prepared "Guidelines for the Initial Preparation of Chief School Business Administrators" for use in designing and evaluating college and university programs that prepare school business administrators. In September 1991, these guidelines were approved by the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) (Everett 1991).

Anderson, Mark E. *Principals: How to Train, Recruit, Select, Induct, and Evaluate Leaders for America's Schools*. Eugene, Oregon: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, 1991. 126 pages. ED 337 843.

Bridges, Edwin M. *Problem-Based Learning for Administrators*. Eugene, Oregon: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, 1992. 164 pages. ED 347 617.

Everett, Ronald E. "NCATE Accepts ASBO's Guidelines for Preparing Chief School Business Administrators." *School Business Affairs* 57, 12 (December 1991): 31-32.

Hallinger, Philip, and Joseph Murphy. "Developing Leaders for Tomorrow's Schools." In *Proceedings from the Invitational Symposium on Recruitment, Selection and Retention of Principals for Tennessee's Schools*, edited by Barbara A. Nye. 36-47. Nashville, Tennessee: The Center of Excellence for Research in Basic Skills, 1992. ED 422 811.

Hersey, Lenor. "Assessment Centers: Identifying and Developing Effective Principals." In *Proceedings from the Invitational Symposium on Recruitment, Selection and Retention of Principals for Tennessee's Schools*, edited by Barbara A. Nye. 48-50. Nashville, Tennessee: The Center of Excellence for Research in Basic Skills, 1992. ED 422 811.

Lee, Ginny V. "Peer-Assisted Development of School Leaders." *Journal of Staff Development* 12, 2 (Spring 1991): 14-18. EJ 431 945.

Murphy, Joseph, and Philip Hallinger. "The Principalship in an Era of Transformation." *Journal of Educational Administration* 30, 3 (1992): 77-88.

National Association of Elementary School Principals. *Proficiencies for Principals. Elementary and Middle Schools*. Revised edition. Alexandria, Virginia: NAESP, 1991. 58 pages. ED 331 131.

National Commission for the Principalship. *Principals for Our Changing Schools: Preparation and Certification*. Fairfax, Virginia: National Commission for the Principalship, 1990. 50 pages. ED 326 953.

National Policy Board for Educational Administration. *Improving the Preparation of School Administrators: An Agenda for Reform*. Charlottesville, Virginia: NPBEA, May 1989. 33 pages. ED 310 493.

_____. *Principals for Our Changing Schools: The Knowledge and Skills Base*. Charlottesville, Virginia: NPBEA, January 1993. 570 pages.

Olson, Lynn. "Principals' Group Creates Alternative-Certification Program." *Education Week* XI, 15 (December 11, 1991): 20.

Pence, L. Jean. *Mentorship Programs for Aspiring and New School Administrators*. Eugene, Oregon: Oregon School Study Council, 1989. 44 pages. ED 304 795.

Schmuck, Richard A. "Beyond Academics in the Preparation of Educational Leaders: Four Years of Action Research." Eugene, Oregon: Oregon School Study Council *Report* (Winter 1993): 1-10.

Thomson, Scott. *A Blueprint for Change*. Charlottesville, Virginia: National Policy Board for Educational Administration, 1992. ED 341 144.

University Council for Educational Administration. *Leaders for America's Schools: The Report of the National Commission on Excellence in Education*. Tempe, Arizona: UCEA, 1987. 65 pages. ED 286 358.

Women and Minorities in Educational Administration

It's easy to assume that women and minority representation in educational leadership has greatly improved over the past two decades. Recent evidence shows progress has been steady, but slow. Discrimination and sex-role stereotyping still appear to prevail in the hiring process and on the job.

According to a 1989 National Center for Education Statistics report (Ogle and Alsalam 1990) based on 1987-88 figures, 24.4 percent of public school administrators are female; 11.4 percent are minorities; and 8.8 percent are African-Americans. A 1988 American Association of School Administrators survey found an improved figure (29.9 percent) for women administrators and a slightly higher figure (9.9) for African-American administrators (Jones and Montenegro 1988). The same survey discovered that only 4 percent of superintendents were women and only 1 percent were African-American. Until very recently, the percentage of women principals (now about 25 percent) actually decreased—a situation matched only by the "disappearing" African-American principal during the fifties and sixties.

Promise of Change

Changing U.S. population and work-force demographics should favor the advancement of minorities and women into school administration. White males are a minority for the first time in history (McGrath 1992), and women have been entering the labor market in increasing numbers for the past fifty years (U.S. Department of Commerce 1991). In 1990, 57.5 percent of all women in the civilian population were employed, compared with 43.3 percent in 1970. Currently, women comprise 46 percent of the civilian work force (United States Government Printing Office 1992). During the coming decade, the U.S. Department of Labor predicts that "75 percent of those entering the work force will be minorities or women" (McGrath). The expected retirement of half of all U.S. principals should create ample administrative job opportunities for women and minorities.

Women are underrepresented in public-school administration in comparison with private-sector and managerial positions in other fields. During 1987-88, women held 52 percent of private-school administrator positions (Ogle and Alsalam) and 40.9 percent of management positions across many fields (U.S. Department of Commerce). Women currently comprise over half the students in graduate educational administration courses, receive nearly half as many educational administration doctorates, and generally hold higher levels of certification than male administrator candidates (McGrath).

A growing body of research is finding that women principals elicit higher teacher and student performance and that women's "front-line" experience and collegial leadership are valuable assets to both schools and corporations (Helgesen 1990, Peters 1990). Earlier studies concerning women's limited career aspirations, family-work conflicts, and aversion to policy-making are being contradicted by new evidence. For example, the 142 female aspirants in Sakre Edson's longitudinal study "expressed great interest in administrative work,...spoke repeatedly about wanting the power and authority to change schools," and "ranked family responsibilities low on their list of career barriers" (Edson 1988).

Minority Representation

African-American and other minorities face even greater obstacles to fair representation in school administration, because few are in the "pipeline" for managerial positions. Compared to women, African-Americans have made only modest gains in managerial and executive posi-

tions in all fields except financial management; nationally, only 6.1 percent were managers in 1989, up from 5.6 percent in 1983 (U.S. Department of Commerce 1991).

Although more African-Americans are graduating from high school, fewer are enrolling in college, due to scant financial resources and cutbacks in student aid. Of those attending college, disproportionately fewer are attracted to educational administration, though this profession's employment rate is higher than for most other managerial fields. Hispanics have made modest gains in school administration and other managerial fields but are still grossly underrepresented in administrative ranks. These trends are disturbing, since schools are serving increasing numbers of minority children without leadership role models in school settings.

Obstacles to Equality

Both minorities and women have been further hampered by ineffectively enforced Affirmative Action programs and Civil Rights legislation, waning interest in their special problems, and insufficient data charting their progress. Research cannot progress without a national database, a reliable data collection system, and standard reporting categories (Mertz and McNeely, November 1990).

Recent literature attempts to identify and understand the persistence of discrimination within a predominantly white male administrative culture. According to one survey of male and female superintendents, the root of the problem "may be an old boy network more fundamentally grounded in sports than previously thought" (Schuster and Foote 1990); the "ball club" further excludes women by making important decisions on the golf course or at other offcampus hideouts (Hyle 1991). Others find would-be women administrators' paths blocked by negative and patronizing attitudes, dead-end work assignments, improper mentoring and sponsorship, and lack of encouragement or serious consideration (McGrath 1992, Grant and Martin 1990).

Women and minorities are also hampered by organizational tokenism, past discrimination practices, and misguided attempts to put black faces and skirts on the same old leadership structure (Russell and Wright 1990, Konrad and Pfeffer 1991). Other persistent problems include jealousy and lack of support from colleagues (Mertz and McNeely, April 1990; Edson 1987) and lower administrative salaries for women and minority administrators (Adkison and McKenzie 1990).

Being hired is no guarantee of success. As McGrath notes, "the majority of women administrators hold central office staff positions" or are elementary school principals with minimal chance of advancement. Women who do achieve top positions tend to pursue male-patterned career paths leading through the high school principalship to the superintendency (Shakeshaft 1989), but generally work three times as hard to reach each successive rung. High-achievers can suddenly find themselves isolated, demoted, involuntarily transferred, or even dismissed (Cohn 1989, Hyle 1991). Several recent papers examine women administrators' career patterns and strategies for success (Murphy 1988, Funk 1988, Young 1990, Mertz and McNeely, April 1990). Fewer studies track successful minority administrators; the best recent example is a paper describing seven African-Americans' reflections on managing racially diverse schools in Nevada (Nelson and Williams 1990).

Proposed Solutions

What can be done to equalize competition for school leadership positions? A chapter (Coursen and others 1989) of this Clearinghouse's *School Leadership: Handbook for Excellence* charts the progress of an ambitious campaign to establish new hiring procedures, eliminate all forms of discrimination, establish a clearinghouse providing names of qualified minority and women candidates, reorient and revamp educational training programs, and develop internships and mentoring programs for potential administrators. Although no clearinghouse exists and discrimination has yet to be eliminated, recent literature discloses a few promising new developments.

One such development is women's own determination to promote themselves and over-

come institutional resistance through enlightened career planning, mentoring, and networking opportunities. Edson's eleven-point program for female administration aspirants is a comprehensive approach embracing career planning; obtaining visible and mobile leadership experience; and taking advantage of networking, sponsorship, and unplanned events (Edson 1988). Ruth Rees also stresses the value of perceived competency through high visibility, but charges educational institutions with the responsibility for establishing truly equitable hiring practices and providing opportunities for women to demonstrate their leadership skills (Rees 1991).

Mentoring is essential to acquiring administrative positions, according to many experts (Whitaker and Lane 1990). The problem is creating formal same-sex mentoring programs designed to showcase women's abilities, provide informal training, and guarantee organizational mobility. Collegial networking, which stresses mutual support, genuineness, empathy, and respect instead of competition and mutual exploitation, offers another effective way for women and minorities to advance professionally and broaden contacts with influential persons of both sexes (Pancrazio 1991).

Finally, a few studies have tried to evaluate some federally and privately funded efforts to increase female representation in administration. One study explored the usefulness of assessment center attendance. It found that male attendees received preferential treatment in subsequent hiring situations, though they were judged as no more skilled than women attendees (Schneider and Wallich 1990). Of numerous internship programs summarized in Shakeshaft's book (1989), FLAME (Female Leaders for Management in Education) seems to be the most successful at training and placing participants.

Among southern states, Duval County, Florida's Administrative Internship Program (AIP) and the University of South Carolina's Minority Administrator Program (MAP) received high ratings by participants (Tonnsen and others 1989, Thompson and Bjork 1989). North Dakota's Women and Minorities in Administration program, which provides a weekend scheduling format, reduced tuition rates, and innovate elective courses designed specifically for participants, was also higly rated (Chance and Neuhauser 1990-91).

Adkinson, Judith, and Carol McKenzie. "Compensating School Administrators: The Impact of Personal and Organizational Characteristics on Administrator Salaries." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, Massachusetts, April 16-20, 1990. 39 pages. ED 323 640.

Chance, Edward W., and Margo Neuhauser. "Preparing Women and Minorities as Rural School Administrators." *Rural Educator* 12, 2 (Winter 1990-91): 1-5. EJ 427 609.

Cohn, Kathleen C. "Factors Associated with the Involuntary Reassignment of Three Women Principals." Paper presented at the annual conference of Research on Women and Education, a special interest group of the American Educational Research Association, San Diego, California, November 1989. 25 pages. ED 314 831.

Coursen, David, and others. "Two Special Cases: Women and Blacks." In *School Leadership: Handbook for Excellence*, 2nd ed., edited by Stuart C. Smith and Philip K. Piele. 85-95. Eugene, Oregon: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, University of Oregon, 1989. ED 309 504.

Edson, Sakre K. *Pushing the Limits: The Female Administrative Aspirant*. Albany, New York: State University of New York Press, State University Plaza, 1988. 299 pages. ED 307 721.

_____. "Voices from the Present: Tracking the Female Administrative Aspirant." *Journal of Education Equity and Leadership* 7, 4 (Winter 1987): 261-77. EJ 369 764.

Funk, Carole. "Career Paths and Work Patterns of Women in Mid-Management Roles in Business and Education." Paper presented at the Texas Woman's University Conference on Women and Work, Arlington, Texas, May 1988. 8 pages. ED 299 664.

Grant, Geraldine P., and James A. Martin. "Sex Discrimination in West Virginia Principal Hiring Practices." Paper presented at the Southern Regional Council on Educational Administration Conference, Atlanta, Georgia, November 11-13, 1990. 15 pages. ED 328 982.

Helgesen, Sally. *The Female Advantage: Women's Ways of Leadership*. New York: Doubleday/Currency, 1990. 263 pages.

Hyle, Adrienne E. "Women and Public School Administration: Invisibility and Discrimination." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, April 3-7, 1991. 20 pages. ED 335 770.

Johnson, Janet R. "Networking: How to Permeate the Glass Ceiling—Some Highlights from Recent Studies of Networking among Women." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American

Educational Research Association, Chicago, April 3-7, 1991. 8 pages. ED 332 356.

Jones, Effie H., and Xenia P. Montenegro. *Women and Minorities in School Administration*. Washington, D.C.: Office of Minority Affairs, American Association of School Administrators, 1988. 46 pages. ED 273 017.

Konrad, Alison M., and Jeffrey Pfeffer. "Understanding the Hiring of Women and Minorities in Educational Institutions." *Sociology of Education* 64, 2 (July 1991): 141-57. EJ 438 420.

McGrath, Sue Thrasher. "Here Come the Women!" *Educational Leadership* 49, 5 (February 1992): 62-65. EJ 439 353.

Mertz, Norma T., and Sonja R. McNeely. "Groundbreakers: Females Who 'Succeed' in Male-Dominated Line Administrative Positions." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, April 16-20, 1990. 22 pages. ED 320 299.

_____. "Theoretical and Methodological Problems in Research on Females in Educational Administration: Focusing on 'The Numbers'." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association, New Orleans, Louisiana, November, 1990. 25 pages. ED 331 175.

Murphy, Lila C. *Women in Vocational Education Leadership Positions: Factors Influencing Success. Final Report*. Dover, Delaware: Delaware State Department of Public Instruction, Division of Vocational Education, 1988. 56 pages. ED 294 033.

Nelson, Linda, and Judith Williams. *Reflections on Leadership by Nevada School Administrators of Colour*. San Francisco, California: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, 1990. 56 pages. ED 329 001.

Ogle, Laurence T., and Nabeel Alsalam, editors. *The Condition of Education, 1990, Volume 1: Elementary and Secondary Education*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Schools and Staffings Survey, 1989. 86-7, 94-5. ED 317 626.

Pancrazio, Sally Bulkey. "Alternate Collegial Model-Based Forms of Networking among Women or Networking in the Nineties for the Professional Woman." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, April 3-7, 1991. 8 pages. ED 333 556.

Peters, Tom. "The Best New Managers Will Listen. Motivate. Support. Isn't That Just Like a Woman." *Working Woman* (September 1990): 142-43, 216-17.

Rees, Ruth. "Changing Hiring Patterns: A Case of Changing Perception. Suitable Suggestions for Both Board Officers and Women Job Aspirants." *Education Canada* 31, 3 (Fall 1991): 8-15.

Russell, Roberta J., and Ruth L. Wright. "Visible Minorities and Women in Education Leadership: A Report of Research in Progress." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Canadian Council for Multicultural and Intercultural Education (4th), Ottawa, Ontario, 1990. 36 pages. ED 337 867.

Schneider, Gail T., and Lynn Wallich. "Assessment Centers as Avenues to Administrative Career Advancement." *Planning & Changing* 21, 4 (Winter 1990): 225-38. EJ 437 646.

Schuster, Daphne J., and Tom H. Foote. "Differences Abound between Male and Female Superintendents." *The School Administrator* 47, 2 (February 1990): 14-19. EJ 402 406.

Shakeshaft, Charol. *Women in Educational Administration*. Updated Edition. Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications, Corwin Press, 1989. 220 pages. ED 341 126.

Thompson, Thomas E., and Lars G. Bjork. "A Collaborative Approach to Preparing Minority Administrators." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Southern Regional Council on Educational Administration, Columbia, South Carolina, November 11-14, 1989. 38 pages. ED 313 782.

Tonnsen, Sandra, and others. *Programs for Preparing Minorities and Women in Educational Administration*. Triangle Park, North Carolina: Southeastern Educational Improvement Laboratory, 1989. 34 pages. ED 304 768.

U.S. Department of Commerce. *Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1991, 11th Edition*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Commerce, 1991. 986 pages.

United States Government Printing Office. *Economic Report of the President*. Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1992: 423 pages.

Whitaker, Kathryn S., and Kenneth Lane. "Is a Woman's Place in School Administration?" *School Administrator* 47, 2 (February 1990): 8-12. EJ 402 405.

Young, Beth. "Chance, Choice, and Opportunity in the Careers of Four Women Educators." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Canadian Society for Studies in Education, Victoria, British Columbia, June 3-6, 1990, 35 pages. ED 323 668.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Instructional Personnel

Even a quick look at the demographics of the teaching work force reveals the challenges that school district personnel offices and school administrators will face in the years ahead. In 1970 the average age of teachers was twenty-five years; in 1990, it was forty-four years. During this decade nearly a million teachers will reach retirement age. According to Auriemma and others (1992), "Teachers who are age 30 or younger are now outnumbered by those over 50 (310,901 to 416,857)."

The maturing of the teaching corps is a reflection of the higher status and improved salaries and benefits that the profession receives. Teaching is now widely accepted as a career, not just a stepping-stone to another profession. Nationally, the turnover rate among teachers has declined sharply during the past two decades, from 21 percent to about 6 percent.

Early Retirement Incentives

As teachers age, their seniority and salaries rise. The national average salary for teachers is now $34,000, and senior teachers in some districts receive more than $70,000 a year. A larger-than-ever proportion of school-district budgets now goes to the salaries of top-level instructors. Consequently, more school districts and states are realizing they can save money by encouraging older teachers to retire early.

Districts are offering a variety of early retirement enticements: flat cash bonuses, payouts of a percentage of salary, and buy-back of accumulated sick days. From a cost-analysis of six small districts' early retirement plans, Auriemma and others concluded that "retirement incentive plans can play a significant role in cutting the costs of education and reducing the number of staff without forcing districts to resort to layoffs." Over a three-year period, five of the districts saved between $484,000 and $1,054,000, and all were able to replace those who retired with qualified new teachers.

Recruitment, Selection, and Induction

Whether teachers opt to retire early or at the normal age, school-district officials eventually must cope with the task of hiring a new generation of teachers. One challenge will be to hire the most capable candidates. Past studies have indicated that districts do not follow appropriate selection procedures and thus overlook the most qualified applicants (Weaver 1979, Perry 1981, Browne and Rankin 1986, Jensen 1987).

Another challenge will be to clarify the roles of central-office personnel specialists and school principals in the decision to hire. Staff selection has become a sensitive management issue in school systems that have adopted some form of site-based management, where principals are customarily given increased authority and held more accountable for students' success. Often, however, superintendents retain the authority to hire teachers. As decision-making structures change, the balance of principal, teacher, and the central-office involvement shifts ("Hiring Power" 1991, Ross 1991, Vann 1991).

Bridges (1990) points out that the anticipated influx of new teachers presents school districts with a "window of opportunity" to upgrade the quality of their teaching faculties. A commitment to competent performance in the classroom, a thorough teacher-evaluation procedure, the remediation of poorly performing teachers, and the unflinching dismissal of those who do not improve are the major components of the integrated districtwide approach recommended by Bridges.

Staff Development

Induction programs and staff-development programs will also receive increased attention as school districts seek to tap the potential of new teachers. In recent years, the field of staff development has grown enormously as a reflection of national and local efforts to improve schools.

Reforms such as school restructuring and school-based management require extensive inservice training for teachers. Restructuring often creates new leadership roles such as lead teachers, teacher researcher, mentor, and curriculum developer that require new skills.

Since the mideighties, more teachers have also been assuming the role of staff developer, training other teachers in specific instructional techniques, cooperative learning, peer tutoring, and other content. Consequently, school districts are rethinking the traditional methods of organization and delivery of inservice programs to their instructional staff.

Greater Flexibility in Allocation of Human Resources

During the 1980s, several states experimented with alternative routes to certification for teachers. In the 1990s, the ceiling on schools' financial resources and the rising salaries of teachers have combined to force policy-makers to reconsider the traditional staffing structure. Albert Shanker has suggested bringing adults into schools to assist in instruction, having roles comparable to that of a nurse or technician (cited in Conley 1993). One school in Dade County, Florida, has the goal of lowering pupil-teacher ratios to about 12-to-1 by pairing veteran teachers with paraprofessionals, instructional interns, or other junior teachers.

Conley points out that school districts need to be committed to continuing the professional development of auxiliary instructional staff. Districts may be able to move paraprofessionals from school to school as needed more easily than they can move teachers, whose contracts protect them from forced transfer. Such flexibility in personnel assignments takes on added importance in restructuring schools, as they redefine their purpose, curriculum, and learning environment.

Performance Incentives

Career-ladder programs and other teacher incentives exist in twenty-five states, according to a recent report by the Southern Regional Education Board (1992). The career-ladder movement appears to have peaked; after four states recently abandoned the programs, only seven states now fund career ladders. Seven states provide monetary rewards for schools or districts that show improved student performance, but bonuses tied to the individual teacher's performance are rare, the report stated.

Auriemma, Frank V.; Bruce S. Cooper; and Stuart C. Smith. *Graying Teachers: A Report on State Pension Systems and School District Early Retirement Incentives*. Eugene, Oregon: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, 1992. 94 pages. ED 347 620.

Bridges, Edwin M. *Managing the Incompetent Teacher*. Second Edition. Eugene, Oregon: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, 1990. 86 pages. ED 320 195.

Browne, Beverly A., and Richard J. Rankin. "Predicting Employment in Education: The Relative Efficiency of National Teacher Examination Scores and Student Teacher Ratings." *Educational and Psychological Measurement* 46 (Spring 1986): 191-97. EJ 332 471.

Conley, David. *Roadmap to Restructuring: Policies, Practices, and the Emerging Visions of Schooling*. Eugene, Oregon: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, University of Oregon, 1993. 432 pages.

"Hiring Power." *The Executive Educator* 13, 4 (October 1991): 16-17. EJ 432 716.

Jensen, Mary Cihak. *How to Recruit, Select, Induct, and Retain the Very Best Teachers*. Eugene, Oregon: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, University of Oregon, 1987. 58 pages. ED 279 056.

Perry, Nancy C. "New Teachers: Do the Best Get Hired?" *Phi Delta Kappan* 63, 2 (October 1981): 113-14. EJ 252 224.

Ross, James Ray. "Give Us the Power." *The Executive Educator* 13, 10 (October 1991): 18-19. EJ 432 717.

Southern Regional Education Board. *The 1991 National Survey of Incentive Programs and Career Ladders*. Atlanta, Georgia: Author, January 1992. 48 pages.

Vann, Allan S. "At Least Listen to the Principal." *The Executive Educator* 13, 10 (October 1991): 21-23. EJ 432 719.

Weaver, W. Timothy. *America's Teacher Quality Problem: Alternative for Reform*. New York: Praeger Special Studies, 1983.

The School-Choice Movement

School choice is currently one of the most controversial topics in American education. Not only does it have the attention of educators, it has the endorsement of many politicians and a large following of parents and business leaders.

The national debate is taking place within two contexts—a public political and educational one that is about school improvement, and a philosophical one that is about values, identity, and freedom (Cookson 1992). One reason educational choice is so controversial is that it directly addresses a traditional American dilemma: What is the correct balance between individual/family freedom and the rights of the community? The issue centers on defining the nature of the relationship between a government and its people and asks how a government should fulfill a generally accepted responsibility. The choice question asks whether the market, a private mechanism, should be used in the pursuit of a common public goal, education.

Proponents of choice support a variety of plans with equally varied rationales. To understand school choice, a grasp of the different species of choice proposals is helpful. One prominent educator has identified four general forms of school choice policies: education-driven, economics-driven, policy-driven, and governance-driven (Raywid 1992). The premise of the education-driven approach is that diverse learning environments are needed because students have different learning styles and interests and require different amounts of structure. Parents and teachers also have different needs and can benefit from choice. A basic tenet is that choice is desirable because it enhances educational effectiveness while providing greater satisfaction and benefits to students and teachers.

The economics-driven perspective has the most diverse sponsorship of the four basic types of school choice. The most fundamental version patterns school operation on a business model. This perspective was presented in the 1983 report *A Nation at Risk*, which facilitated the argument that competition among schools will produce a better qualified work force, which will increase productivity and economic growth. Also known as the competitive model, this position asserts that competition provides the motivation for all schools to improve achievement and control costs. Schools at the top will attract the most and best students; others will either improve or eventually close.

In the 1970s, the policy-driven perspective viewed choice as a way to achieve equity with regard to school finance. During the 1980s, choice also became linked to achieving educational excellence (Kolderie 1990). Current state legislation, however, is more typically directed toward equalizing educational opportunities than toward improving school quality (Raywid).

The governance-driven approach is garnering the most attention in the choice discussion today. First espoused by libertarians, it sought to remove education from the arena of collective decision-making and return it to individual control. Choice has also been advocated as a way to achieve a more equal distribution of power between schools and families, to make school governance more democratic. However, a recent governance-driven choice proposal targets democratic governance as the problem rather than the solution (Chubb and Moe 1990). Chubb and Moe's market-oriented model of school reform is based on the virtues of consumership, advocating a shift in school governance from democratic politics to the marketplace. They assert that competition among schools in a free market will lead to improved school effectiveness. Their proposition has facilitated other proposals, one of which is to extend and multiply the power to create public schools.

From this discussion, it is apparent that choice is not one policy or proposal, but several. Different orientations create differences in opinion and disagreement about what kind of choice is desirable.

A distinction is often made between school-choice plans that include private schools and those that do not. Plans that exclude private

schools are intrasectional, whereas those that include private schools are intersectional.

Intersectional Choice Plans

Two intersectional choice plans have been prominently discussed: voucher plans and educational expense tax credits or deductions.

Vouchers

In most voucher programs, the state or federal government makes payment to families or directly to schools with an annual check approximately equal to the per-member educational cost of public schools. True voucher plans have been generally unsuccessful and are often criticized on legal and equity grounds. A voucher program implemented in Alum Rock, California, in 1972 eventually evolved into a limited open-enrollment school district (Witte 1992).

The Milwaukee Parental Choice Program, enacted in 1990, provides state aid to nonsectarian private schools. The amount of aid per student is equal to the aid received by the Milwaukee Public Schools. Parents apply directly to the schools for their children's admission; the schools cannot discriminate against students on the basis of race, ethnicity, or prior academic record. In July 1990, ten private schools were certified for participation in the program. Although the program has been challenged in the courts since June 1990, an appeal to the U.S. Supreme Court is unlikely because a federal legal question is not involved (Witte 1992).

In addition to government-funded voucher plans, which have been slow to spread because of political and legal challenges, a number of privately financed vouchers have recently emerged around the country. Beneficiaries of the vouchers are several thousand children from low-income families who receive grants covering about half the cost of private-school tuition. The programs are funded by businesses, private foundations, and individual donors. The first privately funded choice program began only a year ago in Indianapolis, and since then new programs have been launched in San Antonio; Atlanta; Milwaukee; and Little Rock, Arkansas (Walsh 1992).

Public support of vouchers appears to have risen dramatically in recent years, but an accurate reading of public opinion on the matter remains elusive because survey findings have been inconsistent. A July 1992 Gallup survey found that 70 percent of Americans would support government-funded voucher plans that include public, private, and parochial schools, up from 50 percent a year earlier. The level of support for vouchers among African-Americans and Hispanics is even higher (86 percent and 84 percent, respectively) (Lawton 1992). A recent survey by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, however, found that 62 percent of parents with children in public schools oppose giving parents "a voucher which they could use toward enrolling their child in a private school at public expense" (Boyer 1992).

Tax Credits and Deductions

Another intersectional choice plan offers tax credits and deductions for educational expenses. Although less radical than vouchers, this plan has been subject to the same criticisms. As of 1990, there were no serious proposals for tax credits (Witte 1990).

Intrasectional Choice Plans

The intrasectional set of choice proposals (those limited to public school systems) include intradistrict, interdistrict, and statewide plans. *Intradistrict* refers to choice restricted to a school district, and *interdistrict* refers to those programs between districts.

Intradistrict Plans

Magnet Schools

One type of intradistrict plan, magnet schools, are islands of choice within a traditional district-assignment plan. Each magnet school subscribes to a particular educational philosophy or curricular specialty, drawing students who share that interest. Operating in the context of open-enrollment policies, magnet schools have been used as a method for urban desegregation.

About 20 percent of students in urban districts are enrolled in magnet schools (Blank 1990).

Controlled Choice

A controlled-choice plan allows a family to choose among all schools within the student's district. A major constraint is that each school must maintain the desired racial-balance goals of the system. Controlled choice fosters two interrelated purposes—voluntary desegregation and improvement in the quality of schools. Controlled-choice plans attempt to create equitable education by providing choice in a district while preserving the racial/ethnic balance. They differ from other choice plans, such as open-enrollment and voucher models, in that controlled-choice plans do not rely on market competition between schools to generate school improvement. Controlled choice can also be implemented as an interdistrict plan, in which a number of zones or subdistricts are created that often include magnet-school programs (Witte 1990).

Most controlled-choice programs are modeled after a plan first implemented in Cambridge, Massachusetts, in 1981. Families select and rank four schools in their district in order of preference. The district tries to assign students to their requested schools, but also tries to regulate individual schools' capacities and their racial/ethnic composition. Controlled choice has also been adopted by other Massachusetts cities, and plans have been created or are being created in Milwaukee; Seattle; San Jose; Little Rock, Arkansas; Hartford, Connecticut; Rockville, Maryland; and White Plains, New York (Willie 1990/91).

Charter Schools

Charter schools are another form of intradistrict choice. Sometimes referred to as "independent schools," they provide a way to expand existing school structures. Minnesota, the first state to approve charter schools, adopted legislation in 1991 that allows licensed teachers with innovative ideas to form and operate independent public schools under contract with the local school board.

Operating without many of the restrictions placed on traditional schools, each charter school would receive payment from the state for each student equal to the average statewide per-pupil expenditure. In its purest form, it would allow any public agency to sponsor a charter school. Proponents argue charter schools are a "supply side" reform that will expand choice, improve accountability, and free teachers from regulation. Those in opposition fear the potential loss of students and state allowances and claim that the plan is an attempt to introduce private-school vouchers (Olson 1992).

Interdistrict Plans

The second major category of public-school choice is interdistrict. Families can choose public schools located in districts other than the one in which they live. In a statewide plan, access to these districts generally is limited only by the available space and state desegregation standards. Legal suits involving equity prompted voluntary interdistrict efforts to be implemented in St. Louis and Milwaukee (Witte 1992).

Statewide Plans

The third major category of public school choice is statewide choice, which was first enacted in Minnesota in 1988. The plan allows any family to select any public school in the state, and state aid is sent to the receiving school. The program had little impact as of 1990 (Witte 1990).

Critics of school choice in general argue that (1) the selectivity of students will increase inequalities among schools; (2) the geographical distribution of students by race and class will promote school segregation; (3) the special needs of students will not be met as well; (4) accountability will be reduced; (5) information on schools will be costly, inadequate, and unequally accessible; (6) the social functions of education will be threatened; (7) research determining the link between choice and improved student achievement has been inconclusive; and (8) parental decision-making will be based on considerations other than achievement outcomes.

Proponents argue that school choice will produce (1) less bureaucracy; (2) improved staff motivation and leadership; (3) greater parental

involvement; (4) more diversity and flexibility; (5) improved student achievement; and (6) lower costs and increased efficiency.

Choice will likely remain a part of the American educational policy scene. In 1991, a total of twenty-nine states had some sort of choice provision (Consortium for Policy Research in Education 1991). However, until conclusive evidence of improvement in student achievement is accumulated, state policy-makers should weigh the opportunities presented by school choice against its legal, political, and geographic constraints.

Blank, Rolf K. *Survey of Magnet Schools: Analyzing a Model for Quality Integrated Education.* Washington, D.C.: James H. Lowry and Associates, 1983. ED 367 330.

Boyer, Ernest L. *School Choice.* Ewing, New Jersey: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1992. 118 pages.

Chubb, John E., and Terry M. Moe. *Politics, Markets, and America's Schools.* Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution, 1990. ED 336 851.

Consortium for Policy Research in Education. *School Choice Legislation: A Survey of the States.* CPRE Occasional Paper. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Consortium for Policy Research in Education, 1991. ED 344 346.

Cookson, Peter W. "Introduction." *Educational Policy* 6, 2 (June 1992): 105-22.

Kolderie, Ted. *Beyond Choice to New Public Schools: Withdrawing the Exclusive Franchise in Public Education.* Washington, D.C.: Progressive Policy Institute, 1990. ED 327 914.

Lawton, Millicent. "Gallup Poll Finds Wide Support for Tuition Vouchers." *Education Week* XII, 3 (September 23, 1992): 1, 16.

Office of Educational Research and Improvement. *Getting Started: How Choice Can Renew Your Public Schools.* Washington, D.C.: OERI, U.S. Department of Education, August 1992. 56 pages. ED 348 756.

Olson, Lynn. " 'Supply Side' Reform or Voucher? Charter-School Concept Takes Hold." *Education Week* 11, 17 (January 15, 1992): 1, 22.

Raywid, Mary Anne. "Choice Orientations, Discussions, and Prospects." *Educational Policy* 6, 2 (June 1992): 105-22. EJ 455 756.

Walsh, Mark. "Hundreds Turn Back on Public Schools as Privately Funded Vouchers Take Hold." *Education Week* XII, 2 (September 16, 1992): 1, 18.

Willie, Charles V. "Controlled Choice Avoids Pitfalls of Choice Plans: Response to John Chubb and Terry Moe." *Educational Leadership* 48, 4 (December 1990/January 1991): 62-64. EJ 418 194.

Witte, John F. *Choice in American Education. Policy Issues.* Charleston, West Virginia: Appalachia Educational Lab, 1990. ED 325 948.

_____. "Public Subsidies for Private Schools: What We Know and How to Proceed." *Educational Policy* 6, 2 (June 1992): 206-27. EJ 445 761.

School Finance

In their attempt to secure funding for schools, policy-makers at the state and local levels are dealing with such issues as geographic disparities in spending, scarcity of financial resources, and revision of state funding plans.

Financial Equity

Both the educational and popular press have in recent years publicized the great financial disparity that exists among school districts throughout the U.S. (Barton, Coley, and Goetz 1991; Kozol 1991). Most states routinely spend two to five times more per pupil in their wealthiest districts than they spend in their poorest districts (Harp 1992). The statistics on per-pupil expenditures across states raise other serious questions about the equity of educational opportunity offered to students in the U.S. For example, during the 1989-90 school year, a student residing in Arkansas could expect only $2,423 to be spent on his or her education, while a student living in Alaska enjoyed an investment of $7,411 (Odden and Picus 1992).

National averages for per-pupil spending based on other geographic factors also point to funding inequities across state boundaries. According to a recent report by The Council of Great City Schools (1992), an average of only $5,200 per pupil per year was spent on education in large urban schools, compared to $6,073 per pupil in suburban schools. Likewise, rural school districts spent almost $600 less each year per pupil than suburban districts spent.

During the past five years, court rulings in Texas, New Jersey, Kentucky, and Montana have required legislatures in those states to devise educational funding plans that achieve greater financial equity among their school districts. Rulings on school-finance litigation are currently pending in sixteen states, with the possibility of lawsuits being brought in an additional five states (Odden and Picus). If the courts continue to mandate the design of school-funding plans that guarantee more equitable distribution of financial resources, the 1990s will certainly become a decade marked by radical change in school-funding structures.

Sources of Revenue

Other changes in school-finance structures include shifting sources of revenue. Between 1980 and 1990, the portion of educational funding derived from federal sources fell from 9.8 percent to 6.3 percent, while the portion derived from state sources rose from 46.8 percent to 49.4 percent. In 1990, local funding sources accounted for 44.3 percent of educational revenues, up from 43.4 percent in 1980 (Odden and Picus).

If these trends continue, local school districts will have to depend on gains in revenues derived through higher state and local tax rates in a political climate highly resistant to increased taxes. Some states and local districts have come to rely on relatively new and unstable sources of educational revenue, such as state lotteries. Controlling costs and convincing the general public of the need for additional monies for education will continue to be a major challenge facing educational administrators in the coming years. At the present time, more than forty states are in financial difficulty to the extent they are making serious cuts in education spending.

State Financial-Aid Formulas

McGuire (1990) cites several reasons why state "school funding formulas might need significant reform to bring them in line with the times." Most state school financial-aid formulas were designed and implemented in the early and middle 1970s. In recent years, enrollments have begun to grow again in some parts of the country, and land values have stabilized or declined. In addition, schools have had to expand programs and services for various special student populations. The result of these trends has been to place upward pressure on local tax rates.

Among states that have recently overhauled their funding formulas, there is a pronounced trend toward "foundation" programs that provide a minimum level of per-pupil funding, according to a report by the American Education Finance Association and the Center for the Study of the States (Gold and others 1992). Three-fourths of the states now utilize foundation programs.

To date, school-finance policy has emphasized the equitable distribution of state money to school districts. The Education Commission of the States (1992) recommends that states redesign their basic finance formulas to focus on excellence as well as equity. "New finance formulas should focus on the needs of students, not the maintenance of organizations, and should be made in light of the dual goals of equity and improved performance."

Throughout the 1990s, school-finance policy will be increasingly linked to student outcomes and educational productivity, states Odden (February 1992). He anticipates that "equity issues of the 1990s are likely to be disparities in student outcomes. . . . The issue may be less the variation in dollars per student and more the degree to which those dollars help districts and states meet new and ambitious national and state education goals."

Impending Financial Issues

Odden (1992) identifies seven areas of education reform that will demand changes in school-finance structures during the next few years: (1) the linkage between the basic school-finance structure and education goals; (2) teacher compensation; (3) site-based management and site-based budgeting; (4) accountability systems linked to student-performance goals; (5) public school choice; (6) complementary state policy roles; and (7) nontraditional education issues such as preschool, extended-day kindergarten, and noneducation children's services.

Odden predicts that the 1990s will see a continued rise in public-school funding. He notes that during each of the four decades from 1950 to 1990, educational spending has increased, and that "unless history completely reverses itself, public school funding per pupil will likely rise again during the 1990s."

More emphasis will also be put on measuring educational outcomes in relation to financial input. Research on the linkage between educational funding and educational productivity in terms of student academic achievement has thus far produced mixed results (Hanushek 1989). More data are needed on this relationship so that informed decisions can be made on how to best invest the limited monies available for new educational programs. Educators will need to be increasingly sensitive to the public perception of how education dollars are spent, and they can expect to be held accountable for student-achievement levels in an increasingly cost-conscious society.

Barton, Paul E.; Richard J. Coley; and Margaret E. Goetz. *The State of Inequality*. Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, 1991. 30 pages. ED 340 716.

The Council of Great City Schools. *National Urban Education Goals: Baseline Indicators, 1990-91*. Washington, DC: The Council of Great City Schools, 1992. 218 pages. ED 351 422.

Education Commission of the States. *Bringing Coherence to State Policy: Restructuring the Education System*. Denver, Colorado: Author, 1992. 16 pages. ED 350 675.

Gold, Steven D., and others, eds. *Public School Finance Programs of the United States and Canada, 1990-91*. Albany, New York: American Education Finance Association and Center for the Study of the States, 1992. 667 pages.

Hanushek, Eric. "The Impact of Differential Expenditures on Student Performance." *Educational Researcher* 18, 4 (1989): 45-51, 62. 1989. EJ 390 070.

Harp. Lonnie. "School-Finance Suits Look Beyond Money to Issues of Quality." *Education Week* 11, 39 (June 17, 1992): 1-2.

Kozol, Jonathan. *Savage Inequalities: Children in America's Schools*. New York: Crown Publisher, 1991. 262 pages.

McGuire, Kent. "Emerging Issues in State-Level School Finance." *ERIC Digest* number 56. Eugene, Oregon: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, University of Oregon, 1990. 2 pages. ED 324 777.

Odden, Allan R. (Ed.). *Rethinking School Finance: An Agenda for the 1990s*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1992. 357 pages.

Odden, Allan. "School Finance in the 1990s." *Phi Delta Kappan* 73, 6 (February 1992): 455-61.

Odden, Allan R., and Lawrence O. Picus. *School Finance: A Policy Perspective*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1992. 363 pages.

Labor Relations

Teaching has become one of the most unionized white-collar occupations in the U.S. work force, while at the same time overall union membership in the economy as a whole has been declining. Nearly 90 percent of the 2.2 million public-school teachers belong to a union, whereas fewer than one-sixth (16.8 percent) of all U.S. employees belong to unions (Smith and others 1990). It is obvious that teachers' unions, through the collective-bargaining process, play an important role in the enterprise of U.S. public education.

The educational-reform movement has brought attention to all aspects of the teaching profession, including salary reform, higher certification standards, dismissal of incompetent teachers, more teamwork among administrators and teachers, and decentralization of large school systems. Since most of these matters are related to collective bargaining—some are key features of teaching contracts—such reforms have had widespread effects on school labor relations. It has been argued that collective bargaining in schools poses insuperable obstacles to educational restructuring because of the vested interests of teachers' unions in maintaining the status quo—the seniority system, tenure, centralized teacher assignment, and barriers to dismissal of teachers for incompetence or to mandatory inservice programs.

A number of union affiliates, particularly in big cities, were amenable in the 1980s to reforms that challenged some of these traditional protections and procedures, but the latest wave of reform in the big cities—the push to decentralize school systems—poses a stiffer challenge to the traditional role of unions.

Collective Bargaining and School Reform

One aspect of traditional collective bargaining in schools that has consequences for educational reform is the tension adversarial bargaining fosters between teachers and management. School improvement, attests the research on effective schools, is a product of teamwork between teachers and administrators. How can the two groups' cooperation on school improvement avoid being sidetracked by conflict at the bargaining table (Winn 1983)? The 1986 Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy report noted this concern when it stated that "the confrontational stance that frequently characterizes the relationship between school boards and unions could doom" the report's recommendations.

Notwithstanding these concerns, by the mid-1980s it became clear that well-intentioned school-district officials and teacher-union leaders could use the collective-bargaining process to advance school reform. Beginning in 1985, contracts settled in Cincinnati, Minneapolis, Albuquerque, Rochester, Pittsburgh, Dade County (Miami), Boston, and a number of smaller districts incorporated such reforms as school-based management, decentralized decision-making, peer-review plans, teacher-mentoring programs, and accountability for performance (Smith and others 1990). In addition, a dozen California school districts had entered into policy trust agreements with unions to involve teachers in innovative programs for improving schools (Koppich and Kerchner 1990).

The initiation of reform through collective bargaining has been the exception rather than the rule, however. In 1990, when the National Education Association surveyed its local affiliates involved in site-based decision-making projects, it found that only one-fourth of the projects were regulated by either a letter of agreement or a collective-bargaining agreement. The NEA (1992) has expressed concern that "over time collective bargaining will become marginalized" if school districts succeed in instituting participative organizational cultures outside the collective-bargaining process.

Collaboration Waxes and Then Wanes as Districts Face Fiscal Crisis

When school boards and teachers' unions have used collective bargaining to achieve school reform, the participants have also brought a change to the process of bargaining. Susan Moore Johnson (1987) observed the bargaining process that led to reforms in several districts, including Monroe County, Florida; Toledo, Ohio; Boston; and Hammond, Indiana. This process, she states, "has not typically been that of conventional, bilateral bargaining. Rather, participants tell of efforts to create opportunities for mutual gain, to promote problem solving, and to encourage compromise." Calling this process *collaborative bargaining*, Smith and others (1990) say it goes hand in hand with the reform movement. "The desire to respond to public concerns, involve teachers in decision-making, and restructure the ways schools are run is one reason both unions and management are exploring alternative methods of bargaining."

In the past two years, however, the worsening economy has put a damper on this movement as more school districts, especially in urban areas, experience fiscal crisis. Some of the reforms that had been agreed upon in contracts negotiated in the late 1980s have not been implemented because of a lack of funds. And the content of bargaining has largely returned to bread-and-butter issues. This retrenchment was to be expected, given the "enabling conditions" that must exist before unions willingly collaborate with management on reform initiatives (McDonnell and Pascal 1988). To keep the support of rank-and-file teachers, union leaders must successfully bargain for higher salaries, improved fringe benefits, and other bread-and-butter items before negotiating on school-reform issues.

At present, financial issues continue to dominate the bargaining process in most areas of the country. With no way to increase revenue and with 80 to 90 percent of their budgets already allocated to employee compensation, school districts cannot increase wages and benefits at the rate they did in the seventies and eighties. Some have even resorted to salary cuts. For example, the Los Angeles Unified School District's school board, facing a $400 million deficit, in October 1992 cut teachers' salaries 9 percent, following a 3 percent cut in 1991. The United Teachers of Los Angeles fought the cuts.

One innovative strategy for maintaining a collaborative process of bargaining in the midst of financial constraints involves forecasting the amount of money the district will have available for salaries and benefits (Krueger and Sproull 1991). School boards and teachers unions typically haggle over how sizeable this sum will be, with teachers often projecting a larger amount than management. To avoid conflict over forecasting the districts' financial state, one school district grants salary increases that are determined by a different kind of formula. In August prior to the school year, teachers receive a conservative salary increase. Then in February, after the actual revenues are known for the calendar year, teachers receive "back-pay awards" that are a proportion of the total revenues. "The stresses of negotiating," say Krueger and Sproull, "are reduced to a mathematical formula, forever changing the relationship of the parties in the process." Trust and cooperation characterize the new process.

Restructuring Challenges Traditional Model of Trade Unionism

The recent trend in many of the nation's largest school districts—Chicago, Los Angeles, Detroit, Philadelphia, and Boston are primary examples—is toward breaking down the centralized administration and devolving authority over decisions to the school site, where teachers take on new roles. Conley (1993) notes that decentralization and other aspects of the school-restructuring movement require greater flexibility in collective bargaining, particularly in how working conditions are included in contracts. "Teacher involvement in decisions related to working conditions (schedule, budget allocation, class size, teaching loads, and so forth) causes difficulties for the traditional trade union model of labor-management relations." Conley asks: "How does one teacher file a grievance against a decision made by a group of teachers? Who is the target of the grievance? Who is a teacher and who is an

administrator? These issues are as troublesome for management as they may be for teacher representatives."

Teacher assignment is another thorny issue. Personnel in restructuring schools are encouraged to choose and embrace a vision for what they want their schools to become. But, due to centralized teacher-assignment provisions in the district's contract with the union, hiring personnel may not be free to hire new teachers who share the school's philosophy. The union in Philadelphia, for example, opposes letting some teachers who created charter schools hire the teachers who would work with them. The union argues that such an idea would create division in the ranks (Bradley 1992).

In sum, the unions' egalitarian norms and tendency to create their own bureaucracies to deal with district bureaucracies could threaten the nation's fledgling movement toward school-based management. The success of this movement may well hinge on whether unions give priority to the professional role of practitioners or the traditional role of the union.

Bradley, Ann. "School Reforms Bump Up Against Unions' Most Cherished Protections." *Education Week* XII, 14 (December 9, 1992): 1, 16-17.

Conley, David. *Roadmap to Restructuring: Policies, Practices, and the Emerging Visions of Schooling*. Eugene, Oregon: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, University of Oregon, 1993. 432 pages.

Johnson, Susan Moore. "Can Schools Be Reformed at the Bargaining Table." *Teachers College Record* 89, 2 (Winter 1987): 269-80. EJ 366 867.

Koppich, Julia E., and Charles T. Kerchner. *Educational Policy Trust Agreement: Connecting Labor Relations and School Reform. A Report on Year Two of the Trust Agreement Project*. Berkeley, California: Policy Analysis for California Education, School of Education, University of California, February 1990. 63 pages. ED 320 291.

Krueger, Glenn S., and Lewis R. Sproull. "A Better Approach to Collective Bargaining: Evolving to a Formula-Based Teachers' Agreement." *School Business Affairs* 57, 10 (October 1991): 43-45. EJ 432 800.

McDonnell, Lorraine M., and Anthony Pascal. *Teacher Unions and Educational Reform*. Santa Monica, California: Center for Policy Research in Education and Center for the Study of the Teaching Profession, RAND Corporation, April 1988. 84 pages. ED 293 837.

National Education Association. *Negotiating Change: Education Reform and Collective Bargaining*. Washington, D.C.: NEA, Research Division, 1992. 44 pages. ED 348 751.

Smith, Stuart C.; Diana Ball; and Demetri Liontos. *Working Together: The Collaborative Style of Bargaining*. Eugene, Oregon: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, 1990. 76 pages. ED 321 341.

Winn, Richard. *Collective Gaining: An Alternative to Conventional Bargaining*. Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, 1983. 58 pages. ED 232 251.

Witcher, Ann. "School Facilities—From Elemental to Exemplary." *Educational Facility Planner* 29, 6 (1991): 12-16. EJ 439 338.

Educational Facilities

The field of educational-facilities design and management is facing an interwoven crisis of increased expenses and decreased funds. Increased expenses can be attributed to a number of factors: maintenance and repair of aging buildings, rising energy costs, population growth, and new legal requirements to make schools accessible to the physically disabled.

Deteriorating Buildings

Many of the nation's school buildings are old and will need to be repaired or replaced. According to administrators surveyed by the American Association of School Administrators (AASA), 12 percent of the nation's schools are not adequate places for learning (Hansen 1992).

Background data reveal that 31 percent of the nation's school buildings were built prior to World War II; 43 percent were built during the 1950s-60s, an era of cheap, energy-inefficient construction to meet baby-boom needs. In the AASA survey, administrators defined what made their schools "inadequate." The most frequently cited inadequacies were the following: too old (49 percent); heating or air conditioning bad or nonexistent (20.8 percent); too small, not enough space (19.8 percent); and in need of insulation/window replacement (16.7 percent).

A more limited study conducted by the Education Writers Association in 1989 voiced similar concerns (Lewis and others). Based on data obtained from thirty-eight states covering approximately half the nation's school buildings, the EWA estimated that 25 percent of the nation's schools were inadequate. Of these, 61 percent needed maintenance or major repairs, 43 percent were obsolete, 42 percent had environmental hazards, 25 percent were overcrowded, and 13 percent were structurally unsound.

Because of fiscal shortfalls, school districts often opt to postpone needed maintenance. Unfortunately, while money is saved in the short term, in the long run these districts are faced with even more expensive catchup maintenance. This is not a recent trend. A 1983 study reported: "The data clearly show that schools throughout the nation, particularly those in the older inner cities, have deferred $25 billion dollars of repairs. The bill for postponing this maintenance has come due and will only increase in time" (AASA, NSBA, and CGCS 1983).

According to Lewis and others (1989), "States estimate that today the education infrastructure needs an investment of . . . $41 billion for maintenance and repairs." An estimate in *School Business Affairs* (Fenster 1991) placed "the growing volume of deferred maintenance" at over $100 billion.

Effect on Student Achievement

In an attempt to determine the effect of school buildings on student achievement and behavior, one study reviewed 232 separate research studies (Earthman 1986). Among the findings were that the age of buildings and their thermal, visual, and acoustical environments have a significant effect on learning. In addition, high levels of student density in the classroom result in dissatisfaction, decreased social interaction, and increased aggression.

A study of fifty-two schools in the District of Columbia examined the relationship between building condition and student standardized-achievement scores, controlling for other variables. It found that students assigned to schools in poor condition can be expected to fall 5.5 percentage points below those in schools in fair condition, and 11 percentage points below those in buildings in excellent condition (Edwards 1991).

The Carnegie Foundation states that "a building in poor repair contributes to the attitude and discipline problems among students, which in turn contributes to poor performance in schools" (1988).

Increased Energy Costs

In addition to aging buildings, another factor contributing to increased expenses is the cost of energy. Lighting and climate control in an energy-inefficient school building increases the already high energy costs. The AASA survey found that one-third of school districts have not conducted energy audits and that more than two-thirds of audits already undertaken are outdated. The survey also found that limited knowledge of energy-efficiency procedures has led schools to use the greatest percentage of federal grant funds for building envelope work; however, dollar for dollar, the payback from energy controls was more than four times as great as the envelope payback.

Surges in Enrollment

A third factor pushing costs upward is population growth. Some areas of the country, particularly the South and West, are experiencing swelling enrollments in elementary grades. Enrollment in public schools in kindergarten through grade 8 declined throughout the 1970s, reaching a low point in 1984, but has been rising since that time. Enrollment in grades 9 through 12 increased in the early 1970s, reaching a peak in 1976, and since has been declining. It was expected to begin rising again in the 1991-92 school year (National Center for Education Statistics, June 1992).

Public elementary and secondary enrollment increased more than 10 percent in the states of Washington, Oregon, California, Nevada, Arizona, and Florida between fall 1986 and fall 1991 (NCES, October 1992). Effects of this enrollment increase can be seen in teachers' feelings about class size. The percent of teachers in 1987 who said their typical class is "too large" was 66 percent in California, 48 percent in Nevada, 44 percent in Washington, 58 percent in Utah, 43 percent in Arizona, and 49 percent in Florida. The average number of students per class ranged from twenty-eight in California to twenty-five in Washington (NCES, November 1991). Space for increasing numbers of students will have to come from new construction, facility expansion, or extended use of existing facilities with longer school days or school years.

In addition to having to accommodate more students, some schools are also under pressure to reduce class sizes. Judicial decisions and legislative mandates in many states are requiring fewer students per classroom. For example, Texas has placed a statutory limit of twenty-two students on all classes (Carlin 1991).

The Mandate for Accessibility

Making schools accessible to students with disabilities is required by Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and, more recently, by the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. The intersection between the ADA and Section 504 is the requirement that all new school facilities designed, constructed, or altered must be readily accessible and usable by individuals with disabilities. The two federal laws differ in the effective beginning date for new construction and alteration. Standards for educational facilities cover specifications for such items as doors, windows, entrances, drinking fountains, elevators, ramps, parking and passenger loading zones, protruding objects, space allowances and reach ranges, accessible routes, sanitary facilities, handrails, telephones, and assembly areas (McKinney 1992).

Facilities for the Future

School of the future will be designed to provide areas for specialized programs in the arts, business, science, and other disciplines. The idea of the school as a community center is growing in importance. Such facilities are anticipated to provide health and welfare programs, child care, senior-citizen services, and a full range of cultural, educational, and recreational services (Brubaker 1988).

Hathaway (1991) prescribes a set of general educational-facility specifications suitable into the twenty-first century, including minimizing premature obsolescence.

In a monograph on the future of educational

facilities, the American Institute of Architects predicts that schools of the next century will need to provide environments for both traditional and new ways of educating students, but they will also need to accommodate related educational, social, cultural, and recreational needs of the community (Gribbs 1992).

American Association of School Administrators, National School Boards Association, and Council of Great City Schools. *The Maintenance Gap: Deferred Repair and Renovation in the Nation's Elementary and Secondary Schools*. Arlington, Virginia: Authors, 1983. 80 pages. ED 231 065.

Brubaker, C. William. "These 21 Trends Will Shape the Future of School Design." *The American School Board Journal* 175, 4 (April 1988): 31-33, 66. EJ 370 252.

Carlin, Philip M. "City School Buildings Revisited." *Educational Facility Planner* 29, 5 (1991): 15-17. EJ 437 602.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. *An Imperiled Generation: Saving Urban Schools*. Washington, D.C.: Author, 1988. 78 pages. ED 293 940.

Earthman, Glen I. "Research Needs in the Field of Educational Facility Planning." Paper presented at Edusystems 2000 International Congress on Educational Facilities—Values & Contents, Jerusalem, Israel, November 16-21, 1986. 11 pages. ED 283 301.

Edwards, Maureen M. "Building Conditions, Parental Involvement and Student Achievement in the D.C. Public School System." Master's Thesis, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C., 1991. 100 pages. ED 338 743.

Fenster, Larry C. "Maintenance Services: Keeping Them In-House or Contracting Them Out." *School Business Affairs* 57, 7 (July 1991): 8-12.

Gribbs, Christopher J. "News from the U.S.: American Institute of Architects." *PEB Exchange* 17 (October 1992): 3-4. (Newsletter of the Programme on Educational Building of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development.)

Hansen, Shirley J. *Schoolhouse in the Red: A Guidebook for Cutting Our Losses. Powerful Recommendations for Improving America's School Facilities*. Arlington, Virginia: American Association of School Administrators, June 1992. 40 pages.

Hathaway, W. E. "Schools for the 21st Century: General Specifications." *Educational Facility Planner* 29, 4 (1991): 25-30. EJ 435 763.

Lewis, Anne, and others. *Wolves at the Schoolhouse Door: An Investigation of the Condition of Public School Buildings. A Report of the Education Writers Association*. Education Writers Association, Washington, D.C.: 1989. 64 pages. ED 306 660.

McKinney, Joseph R. "Post-Facilities and Program Accessibility: Section 504 and The Americans With Disabilities Act." *Educational Facility Planner* 30,3 (1992): 23-26. EJ 451 490.

National Center for Education Statistics. *Digest of Education Statistics, 1991*. Washington, D.C.: Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education, November 1991. 477 pages. ED 340 141.

_____. *Digest of Education Statistics, 1992*. Washington, D.C.: Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education, October 1992. 491 pages. ED 349 706.

_____. *The Condition of Education, 1992*. Washington, D.C.: NCES, U.S. Department of Education, June 1992. 421 pages. ED 344 347.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

School Law

School law is an evolving subject, controlled by legislation and court decisions, that affects school boards, administrators, personnel, and students.

School Boards and Administrators

The U.S. Supreme Court has in recent years returned more authority to school boards and administrators. During the time that Warren Burger served as Chief Justice, over one hundred opinions having direct bearing on education were issued. As its membership changed, the Burger Court moved from a social-change orientation to a more conservative attitude (Vacca and Hudgins 1991).

Many court decisions in the 1960s and 1970s regarding student civil rights were decided in favor of students. By the 1980s, the courts began to give administrators more authority. This change of judicial thinking means that school authorities must be reschooled concerning the rights of students. Phi Delta Kappa has published a booklet that should help administrators understand the limits of their authority in matters of freedom of speech; student publications; search and seizure; drug testing; student-initiated religious activities; special education; and student discipline, expulsions, and suspensions (Rossow and Hininger 1991).

Another source of information for school administrators is a monograph, thirteenth in a series designed to summarize judicial decisions on elementary and secondary education issues, published by Educational Research Service (Beckham 1991). The cases included in this edition were selected from judicial decisions found in federal and regional court reports between July 1, 1990, to June 30, 1991. The cases were selected on the basis of their relevance to contemporary problems in public-school settings, their definitiveness as articulations of existing law, and their reliability as consistent guides to educational policy-making and practice (Beckham).

The relationship between the principal and the law has never been easy to define. Shoop and Dunklee (1992) provide basic information on the current status of law, risk, and site-based management as they relate to the legal rights and responsibilities of principals.

Curriculum content is sometimes the subject of litigation. A legal audit of curriculum is a useful tool that provides administrators with a procedure to systematically review local school policies and practices before they become involved in litigation; the audit reveals the potential likelihood a suit would be successful against a school district. Over 160 court cases have been analyzed to develop the items in the legal curriculum audit (Zirkel 1992).

School Teachers and Employees

Over 200 cases reported in 1991 involved precollegiate, public-sector employees. Following a trend similar to past years, the largest number of cases involved dismissal, nonrenewal, demotion, and discipline, with many revolving around the issue of board compliance with district and state policies (Mawdsley 1992).

In November 1991 Congress enacted and the President signed the Civil Rights Act of 1991. The act amends five federal discrimination statutes. This act clearly shifts the balance of power back toward plaintiffs in Title VII litigation and increases the potential liability of employers, including local boards of education, for findings of employment discrimination. The availability of compensatory damages and jury trials may well spur an increase in litigation. As always, the best defense against any employment-discrimination claim is a thorough review of existing practices and procedures to ensure

that they are job related (Allred 1992).

An interesting study investigated how informed 190 New York State middle-school teachers in public schools were about school law and case law related to their professional role. The sample was most deficient in the area of instruction (47 percent) and the most knowledgeable in the area of student rights (73 percent), followed by health and safety (60 percent), and teachers rights and responsibilities (57 percent) (Przbyszewski and Tosetto 1991).

Students

In 1985, the U.S. Supreme Court, in *New Jersey v. T.L.O.*, held that the Fourth Amendment applies to searches and seizures conducted by public-school administrators. Application of the Fourth Amendment varies according to the nature of reasonable suspicion and reasonable scope, areas searched (desks, lockers, automobiles, personal searches including strip searches), and search measures (undercover agents, police involvement, electronic surveillance, canine sniffing for drugs). Considering the nature of reasonable suspicion and reasonable scope, courts have generally upheld school searches and seizures; however, courts have invalidated school searches when school officials failed to describe in detail the particular facts of suspicions (Schreck 1991).

Since the Supreme Court rendered its *T.L.O.* opinion, there have been eighteen reported cases in state courts dealing with searches of students in a school setting that led to criminal or juvenile-delinquency proceedings. Only three decisions invalidated the searches; the remaining fifteen upheld the intervention by school officials (Sanchez 1992).

A recent publication by the National Organization on Legal Problems of Education concentrates on pupils. Court cases are organized in six major sections with brief summaries of relevant cases in subcategories followed by a table of cases cited (Hartmeister 1992).

Students and teachers in private schools are not protected by federal Constitutional law. For example, Catholic school administrators can restrict both student and teacher speech. Although civil courts will not allow religious institutions to evade legal responsibilities by invoking church law, churches have significant autonomy within the wide parameters imposed by civil law (Shaughnessy 1991).

In October 1990 Congress passed and President Bush signed the Education of the Handicapped Act (EHA) reauthorization bill. Under the new legislation the EHA was retitled the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). Much of the litigation in 1991 involved procedural issues, particularly regarding the conduct of administrative and judicial proceedings. Substantive issues, such as the appropriate placement of special-education students in the least restrictive environment, also were frequently litigated (Osborne 1992).

An annotated outline provides recent case law in special education (Zirkel 1991). Based on the 1990 amendments to the EHA, references are in the form of the acronym IDEA.

Allred, Stephen. "The Civil Rights Act of 1991: An Overview." *School Law Bulletin* xxiii, 3 (Summer 1992): 13-17.

Beckham, Joseph C. *School Officials and the Courts: Update 1991*. ERS Monograph. Arlington, Virginia: Educational Research Service, 1991. 49 pages. ED 342 082.

Hartmeister, Fred, Ed. *Case Citations 1992*. Thirteenth Series: Pupils. Topeka, Kansas: National Organization on Legal Problems of Education, 1992. 48 pages. ED 344 338.

Mawdsley, Ralph D. "Employees." In *The Yearbook of Education Law 1992*. 1-35. Topeka, Kansas: National Organization on Legal Problems of Education, 1992. ED 340 117.

Osborne, Allan G., Jr. "Handicapped." In *The Yearbook of Education Law 1992*. 85-114. Topeka, Kansas: National Organization on Legal Problems of Education, 1992.

Przybyszewski, Robert, and Dennis Tosetto. "How Informed are Middle School Teachers about Laws Which Affect Them?" Paper presented at a meeting of the Northeast Educational Research Association, Ellenville, New York, October 23, 1991. 23 pages. ED 343 879.

Rossow, Lawrence F., and Janice A. Hininger. *Students and the Law*. Fastback Series No. 317. Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, 1991. 40 pages. ED 332 373.

Sanchez, J. M. "Expelling the Fourth Amendment from American Schools: Students' Rights Six Years After T.L.O." *Journal of Law & Education* 21, 3 (Summer 1992): 381-413.

Schreck, Myron. "The Fourth Amendment in the Public Schools: Issues for the 1990's and Beyond. Presentation Outline." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Organization on Legal Problems of Education, Orlando, Florida, November 22-24, 1991. 14 pages. ED 342 066.

Shaughnessy, Mary Angela. *The Law and Catholic Schools: Approaching the New Millennium.* Washington, D.C.: National Catholic Educational Association, 1991. 112 pages. ED 341 123.

Shoop, Robert J., and Dennis R. Dunklee. *School Law for the Principal: A Handbook for Practitioners.* Massachusetts: 1992. 349 pages. ED 344 328.

Vacca, Richard S., and H. C. Hudgins, Jr. *The Legacy of the Burger Court and the Schools 1969-1986.* NOLPE Monograph/Book Series No. 41. Topeka, Kansas: National Organization on Legal Problems of Education, 1991. 151 pages. ED 335 733.

Zirkel, Perry A. "Will They Sue? Will They Win? The Legal Audit of Curriculum." *International Journal of Educational Reform* 1, 1 (January 1992): 32-45. EJ 441 089.

_____. "Special Education Law Update II." *West's Education Law Reporter* 66, 3 (June 6, 1991): 901-8. EJ 427 014.

ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management
College of Education, University of Oregon
1787 Agate Street, Eugene, Oregon 97403

TRENDS & ISSUES